#### UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

#### U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT

In the Matter of:

#### PUBLIC HEARING:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT

NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

Massachusetts Institute of Technology 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Room 10-250 Cambridge, MA 02139-4307

Thursday December 16, 2004

The above entitled matter came on for hearing, pursuant to Notice at 7:00 p.m.

#### BEFORE:

Colonel Thomas Koning Commander and District Engineer

Larry Rosenberg, Moderator Chief, Public Affairs

James Hunt, Director Mass. Environmental Policy Act Office

Karen Adams, Chief Permits and Enforcement Branch

**APEX Reporting** (617) 426-3077

# $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

<u>S</u>	PEAKERS:	<u>PAGE</u>	
D	avid Robie	7	
J	ames Kavanaugh	9	
D	avid Rizkallah	9	
M	ichael Baker	9	
S	cott McDonnell	10	
E	ric Arsenelt	10	
R	omeo Desmaris	10	
	avid Wilson ladimir Talanim	11 11	
J	ames Goggin	12	
J	oseph Sass	13	
C	harles Fitzpatrick	16	
J	ames Holske	18	
Y.	uri Rushin	20	
M	arc Tempesta	20	
Р	aul Raynard	21	
C.	hris Dowler	22	
P	aul Hardy	23	
D	ave Comerford	23	
R	ichard Taten	24	
М	ikka McQueen	24	
J	esse Rudavsky	25	

# $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

SPEAKERS:	<u>PAGE</u>
Charles J. Gillis	27
Steven Manning	27
Jerome Prince	28
Christopher Spring	28
Ramon Alicea	29
Clinton McKenzie	29
Patrick McElligott	30
Dan Morganelli	31
Miguel Blake	31
Mark DiBlasi	31
Robert Conrad	32
David Forde	32
Jim Kirchner	32
Robert Arey	35
Mike Wetzel	36
Victor Diprisco	36
Clinton Peabody	37
Joe Lawlor	37
Sarah Benjamin	38
Andy Kurowski	38
Bill Doherty	39
John Bottomly	41

**APEX Reporting** (617) 426-3077

65

Marcus Woods

# $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

<u> </u>	
SPEAKERS:	<u>PAGE</u>
Sue Butler	66
Sven Josephson (for Tom O'Neill)	66
Zach Gordon	68
Andrew Pesek	69
Werner Lohe	70
Barbara Birdsey	71
Jennifer Wolfson	73
Stephen Foraste	73
Edward Burke	77
Jerome Vigil	78
Ed McGuire	79
Bryan Sheehan	80
Anne Larsen	87
Romeo Desmaris	90
Richard A. Kraus	94
Dugan Hayes	97
Malcolm Brown	100
Alan Carrier	101
Joerama Valianti	103
Henry Wood	109
Michael Charney, M.D.	110
James Williamson	122

# $\underline{I}$ $\underline{N}$ $\underline{D}$ $\underline{E}$ $\underline{X}$

SPEAKERS:	<u>PAGE</u>
Riley Neuzebauer	134
WRITTEN STATEMENTS	
Dr. Jonathan Haughton	138
Cindy Lowry, Oceans Public Trust Initiative	143
Tom Gelsthorpe	145
Scott Bearse	151
John McAlpin	154
Dr. Michael Kryzanek	158
Rex du Pont	161
Simon Bunyard	164
John H. Manning and Lydia B. Graves II	167
Tim Burke	171
Ken Samoylenko	173
Piers Sanders	175
Ann MacAdam	176
Dr. Matthew M. Staffier	177
Francis J. Gallagher, Jr.	178
Alan Field	179

### PROCEEDINGS

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

DAVID ROBIE: Introducing David Robie of Weymouth Mass, Secretary of the New England Electric Automobile Association. The Electric Automobile Association is an all-volunteer group with an interest in clean, pollution-free public, but especially personal transportation. members mainly own and drive electric vehicles or even hybrid gasoline/electric or battery/electric charged vehicles. We believe that the best prices readily available, environmentally designed, affordable transportation today are the hybrid, small, one- or two-passenger electric, and that the only choice of the future will be necessarily grid-powered electric.

There are many ways to generate electric power to run these grid-powered vehicles. The majority of this electric power in New England at present is provided by hydrocarbon fuels, either coal, oil, or natural gas. All of these three present fuels have two things in common: one is that they produce carbon dioxide which, according to the findings of much scientific research, is in

excess in our atmosphere and a growing menace to the planet, combined with other hydrocarbon emissions to the air we breathe. The second thing that is in common is that all three fuels are, on a planet-wide scale, disappearing natural resources.

We believe that worldwide switching to a sustainable source of non-polluting electric power is the greatest thing to rev down and finally overcome both these problems, and that this must be done as soon as possible as our growing population, both locally and worldwide, requires more electric power.

We believe that the Cape Wind Project will not only do what its backers claim locally, but be a shining example that will demonstrate to other communities, other states, and other countries that fuelless, sustainable wind electric power is the best kind of power to produce both for the good of the utility companies and their customers and for the good of the planet.

At our meeting Saturday, December 11, it was voted that our Association fully supports both this statement and the Cape Cod Wind power plant.

Thank you.

JAMES KAVANAUGH: My name is James

Kavanaugh, and I'd like to say that I'm in favor

of this project, that we really need it, because

there's a lot of problems with this -- over oil -
this is a renewable source, good jobs, and we

really do need something like this to keep the

economy going. It's very good. Thank you.

DAVID RIZKALLAH: I think this would be a great opportunity; it will create jobs. We need to get away from using oil and stuff like that that we get from Saudi Arabia and stuff. I think this project would be good for the environment.

MICHAEL BAKER: I hold two elected offices in my town of Wilmington. I'm for this project. Most importantly -- I'm in favor of this project. Number one and most importantly, this is clean, renewable energy; it isn't going to put any more pollutants in our environment. And being a School Committee member and a Master Plan Committee member in the Town of Wilmington, we're dealing with 55 percent of our wells shut down right now from chemical pollution, asthma rates are through the roof in the region from all the

big oil and big industry in the Midwest. This country's going to be out of oil in 15 to 20 years anyways. It's about time we had a project that's going to create energy without further destroying the environment. Thank you.

SCOTT McDONNELL: This is definitely a project that needs to be done because it's all regenerated energy, it's going to put a lot of men to work, a lot of women to work, lot of people to work, and it's going to keep foreign oil from our back yard. It's going to keep foreign oil away from us and we're not supporting terrorism over this. We don't want people to die over oil when we can have energy in our yard. Thank you.

ERIC ARSENELT: I'm for Cape Wind because it'll provide a lot of jobs for electricians in my union and also other unions, and it's going to be a good way to conserve energy, many different reasons, and that's about it.

ROMEO DESMARIS: I'm for the Cape Wind project because I figure it's the best alternative to get electricity, it's better than nuclear or coal generation, and where it is six miles out, it

would hardly be seen from the shore, and I always go down the Cape, I'll go down the beaches every year, and if this was going to pollute the area I wouldn't even go for it, but it's something that I figure with electricity, we need it in the future, you've got to start somewhere, and we're running out of oil, there's no need going to Iraq for oil, so, I think it's the best alternative. I think it's a good project. Thank you.

DANIEL WILSON: My name's Daniel Wilson and I'm for the Cape Wind project. I'm a member of Local 103 IBEW, and I feel that this project's very important to help put my fellow union members to work, and I feel that the adverse side effects through having these windmills up are not as much as not having them, especially with the oil crisis in the Middle East, it would be nice to see some natural wind power to be manufactured and the economic benefits would help to bring down the cost of electricity and other things that we pay for every day.

VLADIMIR TALANIM: My name is Vladimir

Talanim, and I support the Cape Cod Wind Project

because I think we need some kind of energy in the

future and oil resources are going to be over soon over, I guess 50 years, and nuclear energy is too dirty and dangerous and we question if we're going to get like cold fusion or something else. So, wind energy is clean and it's not going to be over. I think it's a real good alternative for future power and energy.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JAMES GOGGIN: I am here and I am for the Cape Wind Project. I realize as a union member the economic benefits that we will obtain, but irregardless of that, I'm more concerned with the well-being of not only my children but my grandchildren, which I have both, because of the pollution. I've grown up and lived on the Cape off and on my whole life and I've noticed the deterioration of the water quality, the air quality down there, year in and year out, and it can be all tied directly to fossil fuel emissions. We need to stem this tide and this is one way to start to try to do that. We don't utilize enough wind power in this country, but it's very successful in other parts of the world, and aesthetically it is not as intolerable as people make it out to be.

Another concern that I have is that we are dependent on foreign oil. As we speak right now, we have young people dying in Iraq for oil, and we have a President that is a big oil guy and has done nothing to try to stem the ecological demise of this world and try to utilize alternate energy. Unfortunately we've got four more years of this guy and he really needs to pay more attention to alternate energy. I personally worked in the solar field and that got squashed back in the '80s, all the tax credits to pay for defense spending, and I really firmly believe in If I don't get a job in this project, I don't care; I just want to see clean air, clean water, and get the special interests out of this so that we can use renewable energy so that we can live on a cleaner Earth.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JOSEPH SASS: My name is Joe Sass. I'm here tonight representing myself and my four children. I fish both recreationally and commercially; I have my Captain's license. And I was surprised a director, or representative, I should say, of the Department of Massachusetts Marine Fisheries speaking out against this

project. His credibility asks me questions: what's been done to fish stocks in the past. In my mind the question is how you could even listen to that gentleman.

As a fisherman, both recreationally and commercially, I believe this project would bring more fish into the area. It would have a similar, like you've read in the paper, a re-flight effect. You just have to look down in Louisiana and see that the charter captains go out and fish in the oil rigs there. I think it would be nice to take my children out there and go fishing with them.

The biggest opposition I see against this project is one of people don't want to look at it, they just don't want to look out and see this thing. Well, to those people I would suggest that there are a lot of American families right now that are looking at bodies coming back from Iraq; they don't really want to look at that either. But basically we have a choice. We can continue to send our children offshore and fight for what we know is a war that's, if not wholly, at least partially dependent -- because of our dependency on foreign oil. So, I mean, when you

look at this project from an ecological viewpoint, it's going to probably bring dollars in by charter captains going out there and going fishing. When you look at it from a job viewpoint and a tax viewpoint, you're going to get monies from that, too. When you look at it from a viewpoint of defense, we're not going to have our children over in foreign lands possibly dying. Now, if these people weren't against the wind and you tried to put a nuclear plant, they'd be against the nuclear.

When I was a child I knew one person that had asthma. I have four children; three out of the four have had asthma. Why? Because of the coal-fired energy plants. I mean, we have to do something. It's time to stop talking about, you know, the future is here, we should do this, we should do that, the time is now. We have an opportunity; we should take advantage of it. Again, the people that are saying "no" because they don't -- the real reason is they just don't want to look at it.

And in summary, I think it's a good plan. I think it'll be good for the economy,

good, more importantly, for our children. I look forward to fishing out there. Thank you.

CHARLES FITZPATRICK: My name is Charles Fitzpatrick. I live at 70 St. Rose Street in Jamaica Plain. I've been a resident of Boston my whole life. I just wanted to touch on a few issues that were important to me. One is the economic. I've traveled to Canada a lot and I've seen these windmills. They're tourist attractions; people go to see them everywhere. That's what I -- one of the things I've looked for when I've gone up to Canada. They kept their environment beautiful by using the wind power and you don't see ugly smokestacks and things like that all around the place.

Fishing, I do a lot of fishing, and especially Buzzards Bay and Nantucket Sound. This is going to increase the fish; there's no question about it. All along the coast people are building reefs, artificial reefs to add to fish populations. It's a known fact that it's something that we need here and someone's going to do it for us for free by putting up these windmills.

Sea navigation. I'm a sailor myself,

I'm a responsible sailor, so, I know what is

needed to get around in the water; you have to pay
attention. There's going to be no problems with
navigating on the water if you pay attention to
what you're doing. That's what most people should
be doing anyways.

As far as birds go, I mean, birds do get hit and they get hit flying into buildings that are built out of glass, they think they're part of the -- they're just flying right through the air and they hit these glass buildings. Should we take them down? Ten thousand people were killed in the United States last year in deer collisions. Should we stop people from driving at night, or should we eliminate cars all together just to save the deer populations?

As far as noise goes, I mean, I've heard these windmills, when it gets up over 35 knots they start to screech but after 25 knots they shut off because a windmill can't operate at high speeds or it ruins the unit.

As far as alternative sites, maybe they can build it further offshore off the coast of

Chatham, but this will be the first site, I guess.

But the most important issue to me is health. I have asthma now; it started to develop when I got about 45 years old. It's caused by environmental conditions; it's where I grew up, the exhaust from petroleum-based products, fuel, and it's killing me; it's changed my life forever. I don't wish this on anyone, certainly not on the children that are growing up in the city and the suburbs of Massachusetts, and that's the number one reason why I want this to be built is I don't want more power plants spewing fuel and exhaust. Thank you.

JAMES HOLSKE: I'm very much in support of this, simply because I myself, I spend a lot of time paying attention to these type of things. I watch -- I have a -- actually a friend of mine, a roommate, who works here at MIT, graduate studies oceanographic engineering, and we've actually discussed this project before and how much of the impact that it would have has actually been a point of conversation as they're saying here in some of these discussions. And what I'm seeing coming back from the Army engineers is they're

simply stating that there's not going to be a huge impact as these people out front protesting. I really don't understand it. I think we have a basic responsibility to be using alternative energies in this world today because of the world we're going to be leaving our children.

I've currently been watching C-Span and hearing Senator McCain talking about alternative energy sources, this just being one of them, and how the proper questions are not being asked, and that actually the scientists and representatives of these alternative power sources weren't being basically allowed to speak, their voice wasn't being allowed to be heard. It seems that there's a lot of special interest nowadays and that larger business and industry is simply interested in more of the same, but we need to be trying something different. And this is a clear sign.

The environmental impact that is shown, like I said, has not been substantial. There's no substantiated proof this is going to do any harm and the improvements that it's going to do. And it's obvious to me and to these studies that the improvements far outweigh any possible harm that

could happen. And that's it, basically. I'm in support of it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

YURI RUSHIN: My name is Yuri Rushin, and I'm in favor of the Cape Wind Project. I'm a United States citizen born in Boston, raised in The main reason I'm in favor of this project is my mother has asthma, my daughter has I'm in favor of any type of new energy asthma. that would create a cleaner environment, clean air and less pollution. I'm also in favor of jobs for Americans, more jobs in this area, on our soil. I'm tired of hearing about the gas prices going up and things going on overseas over oil and things like that. I'd just like to see a different type of energy created, a cleaner energy that could be environmentally produced. The wind is free and it's there for all of us, and this is a very good project, and I think we need to look into it more to see what the benefits would be instead of shutting it down before we have a chance to make it happen. And that's the main reason why I'm in favor of it.

MARC TEMPESTA: Well, I believe the Cape Wind is a great thing that's going to happen

hopefully. I think the United States relies way too much on foreign power sources and we really need our own way to produce our own power. We need to increase our own productivity with power, and in doing this in Cape Cod will create 600 to a thousand new jobs for people out of work, the pollution will go down, and we'll actually save \$53 million in health care costs annually. It will allow us to decrease our reliance on fossil fuels from other countries, most importantly.

PAUL RAYNARD: Yes, I am in favor of the Cape Wind Project. The air quality situation we have, these diesel fuels and fossil fuels are going to burn up quick. The project would reduce fossil fuels, plants, they need to reduce that because they're going to get used up quick, and relying on other countries is definitely not the way to go, definitely not the way to go, definitely not the way to go. You should be able to rely on your country. It's bad. A lot of wars and everything start all around oil, money. It's a bad thing. Going natural, natural air, clean air. There are so many positives about this.

The habitat, it's going to ruin the

habitat for the fish and everything else. It's going to create room for the fish when it's all said and done. People won't be able to fish there, and, I don't know, it's just a lot better.

People complain about noise. There isn't going to be that much noise. You ain't going to be able to hear it from the shore, the construction or the windmills themselves.

Navigation, they say it will be a problem for navigation. I don't see that happening. They're going to add horns, lights. It's going to aid navigation, if anything.

The jobs, that's another thing, big jobs, put a lot of people to work building them, maintaining them, and keeping them running.

That's what I have to say. Thank you.

CHRIS DOWLER: I'm for the Cape Wind

Project. The biggest reason is for jobs. The

economy is really lousy right now, and this would

create a lot of well needed jobs. And then the

air quality. Not too many reasons why this

project shouldn't be going full swing because most

of the people that are opposed to it, it seems

like they just don't want to see them, they're

afraid that the birds, the birds are going to get killed. Birds don't fly into wind turbines; they -- I don't know when birds became blind.

The way the global warming is going now, we need to stop relying on fossil fuels and imported oil. Wind has been around forever, it's clean, there's no risk in using wind power.

Electricity can -- you can save a lot of electricity by using wind power. It's going to create a lot of jobs. And the energy, it's energy that's just sitting there waiting to be harnessed and we don't really use that too often. Pretty soon oil is going to run out or the cost of oil's going to be -- it's already up, so, it's going to be really expensive. That's it.

PAUL HARDY: I'm definitely for the Cape Wind Project, just for the jobs it will create, the air quality, no diverse effects on health.

Just the fact that fossil fuels are burning up, polluting the environment, and I just think the air quality is going to improve. The jobs it will create I think are the most important part.

That's it.

DAVE COMERFORD: I'd just like to say

that Cape Wind is a great idea. The air quality alone is worth the entire project. It's great we're going to reduce the use of fossil fuels. The health aspects, unmeasurable, from reduced power plant pollution. And the energy offsetting the burning costs of expensive fossil fuels will really reduce our dependence on foreign oil.

RICHARD TATEN: I think the Cape Wind Project's going to be good because it's going to save air pollution, it's going to bring cleaner oil that's going to make better health for our people. It's going to save energy costs. It's going to create jobs. It's not going to be a hazard to our air navigation, as far as air traffic, planes and all that stuff. It's going to be a good start to eliminate foreign oil. Pretty much I think it's a real good idea.

MIKKA McQUEEN: I am for the Cape Winds
Project and there's a few reasons and the most
important ones are air quality, health and energy.
Anyone who has children would definitely want the
Cape Wind Project to go on because it will be more
natural instead of using as much gas and having
another power plant be built. It will reduce

operations of fossil fuel for the power plant, therefore reducing air pollution and improving air quality.

And -- what else. The energy is the one main reason because it will be more efficient and reduce dependence on natural gas. In addition, it's in compliance with the Renewable Energy Portfolio Standards. That's basically it. Oh, and also, it will give more jobs for the American workers, and getting oil from Saudi Arabia makes no sense, considering there's not going to be anything for Americans. That doesn't make any sense at all.

JESSE RUDAVSKY: Sustainable South Shore is an organization based in Hull, Massachusetts, with members in the surrounding communities south of Boston from Weymouth to Scituate. Our goal is to help create a model, sustainable community and help to preserve our ecosystem as a whole.

Hull, Massachusetts, has had experience with wind turbines. The present Hull Wind One is the largest turbine on the East Coast. The Town of Hull has just given approval to build a second wind turbine on a former landfill site that will

give three times the power output as Hull Wind One. Sustainable South Shore has approved both these turbines and our members have helped in the educational processes to promote this fuel-less, carbon-dioxide-less, global-warming-less, sulphur-less and totally emission-less way of making electricity.

We look forward to a sustainable future, and of all the sustainable power sources available at present, wind is the only one viable for our Town of Hull and the surrounding communities which have no other source of electric power except the grid.

We have observed this wind turbine in action. Wind power upon its claim that bird kills are a major factor, but as yet, with these opponents stalking our seawalls that Hull's got there have been no bird carcasses presented nor pictures proving this. Other opponents have said that they will lower property values. This has not been the case. Property on average within site lines of Hull Wind One has increased this property and the rest of the town has.

If the Town of Hull's one and shortly

two wind turbines will help to make our atmosphere cleaner, most certainly the much higher number of turbines proposed by the Cape Wind Project will do more than Hull Wind does. Also, Cape Wind being a large project, its power output should help in the effort to shut down the dirty coal-burning power plant at Brayton Point in New Bedford. It's estimated that 100 people who work at that plant each year have died to fossil fuel emissions from that plant. Therefore, Sustainable South Shore and Hull Harbor supports the Cape Wind Power Project. Thank you very much.

Of the project. I feel that the economic impact it will create will be very beneficial. I'm an unemployed electrician and could use the job. I also have a place on Cape Cod and do boat in the area. I know the area well, and I don't think it will affect the boating or the fishing to a point of us not requiring it. I think that the fossil fuel consumption will drop, giving a better environment around us completely. And I think that will do it. Thank you.

STEVEN MANNING: I'm in favor of the

project. I think we need to decrease the amount of oil we burn, foreign and other oils. I think the car industry is now testing electric power as the way we should go, electricity and solar. It's cleaner, more efficient, no global warming. I just think it's the right thing for the economy and jobs.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JEROME PRINCE: I'm for the Cape Wind because when they talk about save the birds, I'm talking about saving money. They talk about oil, I think about the disaster that oil does in comparison to clean air. Also, I have a family; I want to keep working. It also makes America self-sufficient, you know, instead of relying on the oil that comes in. And to me it's also showing that I -- it's like kind of people that support -- that are against it to me it's supporting the war to continually import oil. And in this case we can stop supporting the war and fighting in other countries and become self-sufficient, start dealing with the domestic issues more than the international issues. That's it.

CHRISTOPHER SPRING: My name is

Christopher Spring; I'm a resident of the

Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I'd just like to

say that I'm in support of the Cape Wind Project.

It's renewable energy. I think this country needs

to move away from the dependence on fossil fuels,

whether it be foreign or domestic. If this

project gets going, if it seems to work, hopefully

it'll shift the -- be a catalyst or shift the

entire energy policy of the country away from

fossil fuels. And also it will provide work for

the area. That's all that I have to say.

RAMON ALICEA: I'm in favor of the Cape Wind Project. I think it will be a good thing for the environment, create work, jobs, and would mean some renewable -- clean renewable fuels. We need to get away from being dependent on bringing fuel from overseas and we wouldn't have to depend on outside countries for our energy.

CLINTON McKENZIE: Well, the reason why
I came down here to support this cause is because
not only is it creating jobs for people that are
in desperate need of jobs, but if it's going to
save us the hassle of having to send our troops
over there and die for oil and stuff, that when we

can get energy, we should look at all other resources that are here before we even bother and that'll save us from going through all the terrorism and all of that stuff. I have more in stake than just that, so, there's more at stake here, not just fans out there spinning. Know what I mean? There's more stuff here. My kids, my kids' kids. I want to make peace with these people, so, if that's what it takes for me to come out, it takes for us to come out of there and then dip into our resources, then do that, but I just want peace; that's all I want.

PATRICK McELLIGOTT: I'm for the Cape
Project, the Cape Wind Project, for a couple of
reasons. I don't think we should have to rely on
oil from the Middle East or as much oil as we do.
I think air will be a lot cleaner and will also
create 600 to a thousand jobs, not necessarily
union people, but -- even though that's good -but Americans will be put to work. I don't really
think it's going to have an effect on the people
down in Nantucket all that much, maybe while the
project's going on, but not after the project is
done.

DAN MORGANELLI: Pretty much all I wanted to say was that people on Nantucket Sound who are looking out the windows are going to see these big windmills, but wouldn't it be much better to look at their children's faces when they come from Iraq, no blood or oil on their legs, be able to have clean, efficient energy source for them, the children, the children's children will be able to take over a lot of the problems overseas and we'll bring jobs to our community a lot quicker and then we'll be better off.

MIGUEL BLAKE: It's about time for alternate sources of power, and wind is a great alternative because it's cleaner, it's not as dangerous as nuclear, or basically as dirty as gas, and I think it's about time we start to look into alternate sources besides our natural resource that we have, that's solar power or wind power, which I believe is a great alternative.

And, yeah, that's pretty much about it.

MARK DiBLASI: I think it's a good idea, it would be good, cleaner air, no more foreign oil, and it will produce more jobs in the area. That's it. Thank you.

ROBERT CONRAD: I'm for this project because it will provide a lot of jobs, provide cleaner air, we won't have to rely on foreign fossil fuels. And that's about all I have.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

DAVID FORDE: I'm for the Cape Wind Project. I think it will create a lot of jobs. It's better for the environment. And there will be less dependency on foreign oil.

JIM KIRCHNER: I want to state my preference of and favorability or this project due to almost every issue that's been brought up. of them is, first, is air quality. I think it's a good thing, reducing the emissions that go into the Northeast air supply. I think we have enough problems around here with acid rain coming in from the Midwest. We can eliminate some of the contributory factors of fossil fuel burning and spewing emissions into local air quality which will only go down into the water supplies, a growing concern of many, along with the resulting health factors that affect people. I lived in Los Angeles and it was a very awful experience. There was big issues out there, ozone alerts, and where Boston stands with that, I'm a resident, have been

for a long time here, but even here I think there's days when they give ozone levels. I think if we can do anything at all possible to help the general health of the elderly, of working people like myself, or those who have to be outdoors, and our children and so forth and so on, those who are born with some sensitivity of quality by way of it, I think if we can help any of those people it would be a very good, moral thing to do.

All these pollutants also cause global warming. That is a very serious problem. It's well documented that the countries throughout the world are trying to unite. I think the United States is balking at that. It tried to pass a treaty which the United States may or may not want to sign due to whatever factors, but as a concerned citizen I'm one that is concerned about global warming.

Another reason I'm in favor of this project, of course, is the -- I'd like to see the lessening of dependence on foreign fuels. I think the more independent that the United States is as far as energy or any other aspect of any economic or political influence, I think that it would

benefit every American citizen. I know the prices of fuel, we're over a barrel here in the

Northeast, we're at the whim and, you know, it's

-- we always seem to get the worst -- winter, oil prices going up, people can't fuel their own homes, and then we have a definite problem throughout the country, last year in California or the year before there was brown-outs, rolling brown-outs due to electrical maybe manipulation, but if we can reduce our dependence on foreign fuels and foreign government-supplied fuels, I think it's a good thing for the United States, very good for the citizen and for every working person that has to go out there and work to supply and make a living.

I think one of the only things that go along with that is the economic impact of creating jobs. It seems in this day and age when our -- all we read about is jobs going offshore and overseas and it leaves American -- American citizens who are looking for work, who are trying to support families, who would like to pay taxes into the State economies, I think at this stage and at this time in our history of the country we

need every job we can get, and I don't think we should be giving it away, and especially when you see these foreign countries paying the wages that they do over there and we get -- and in turn they import into this country and America gobbles up because we're not supporting the working people throughout the world, we're paying cheap prices for pretty much sweat-shop conditions, and I'd like to see those jobs stay in America. And this project I believe would create a lot of not only construction jobs but also permanent jobs for local residents and Americans. That's about all I have to say. Thank you.

ROBERT AREY: I want to speak in favor of the Cape Winds Project, a renewable source of energy. Numerous construction jobs would be created in the actual building and the maintaining of the equipment, and it's an environmentally sound project. We'll have cleaner air for generations to come. Holland's used wind power for over hundreds of years. I think the United States should take advantage of this source of energy that's there; it just has to be harnessed. We won't need any foreign oil to generate power.

The Army Corps of Engineers have said that there's going to be little or no impact to the environment, may actually help enhance the fishing for some species of fish, and we're going to be able to generate power without any emissions at all. And I wouldn't want my children, my three young kids, I wouldn't want them to be going to a foreign country to fight over oil fields, to fight for oil for this country. We need to become independent and get our energy in a different way than depending on foreign oil.

MIKE WETZEL: I'm for this because it's going to open up a whole bunch of jobs for a whole bunch of people, it's going to clean the air, and there won't be as much pollution from the power plants. I'd like to get rid of having all the oil overseas, having energy this way instead.

VICTOR DIPRISCO: Basically, why I want these to go is it's about time we're having a program to try to do away with oil for our primary needs of energy and all that. It's the pollution, you know, want our air quality better. Just not for us now, for later, for the Earth, global warming. It will produce jobs here. It's just

the air quality, try to do away with oil, stuff like that. Creates jobs here in this country. Costs, you know. That's basically it.

CLINTON PEABODY: I'm for the windmill project because it will employ a lot of people for quite some time and keep people, a number of people employed permanently. I'm for the clean energy, and I feel as though we need to untie our ties with the Middle East for the oil and start depending on ourselves rather than other people.

JOEL LAWLOR: I'm very much in favor of the wind project. I believe it will give us a clean, renewable energy for Cape Cod, which is a pristine environment in itself. I mean, how many times can you run oil barges around the Cape and have them leak on the Cape and have 20 or 30 years before they recover from an oil spill. I think it will be a sin if we didn't build this project to give our future generations some clean, renewable power. It's going to create jobs down there; it's going to help the economy down there. I think it will actually be some place people will come and visit just to see them. I think there's nothing but positive about this project; there's no reason

not to build it.

SARAH BENJAMIN: My name is Sarah
Benjamin. I teach sailing on Nantucket Sound, and
I am supporting the Wind Farm project because in
the long run it will be environmentally
beneficial, and I think the improvements in air
quality are going to surpass that of the site
issues that people have, and I think that overall
it could even increase tourism in the region due
to the interest people have in renewable energy
and how that's expanding in the future. So, I
think everyone should support the Cape Wind
Project.

ANDY KUROWSKI: I would just like to say that the negative impacts from this turbine are strongly outweighed by all the positive effects, and with this in mind, the only argument that people that are giving that is plausible is the aesthetic complaint, but I say that these people need to accept that the turbine farm is well placed in Horseshoe Shoal and that this project is going to contribute to the greater good of humanity. So, I'm greatly in support of this project, and -- yes. That's basically what I have

to say.

I'd also like to comment on the aesthetics of it. People who complain against the aesthetics may not fully understand the true impact that they're going to have on the environment give us impressions of -- upon experiencing them, so, this wind turbine farm will represent clean energy, economy, progress, co-existence, and respect for nature, which are good, uplifting things which reinforce our good intentions. So, with these in mind, then we can -- our idea of what is aesthetic may change. So, yes. Thank you.

BILL DOHERTY: I'm here in favor of the proposed wind farm to be constructed in Nantucket Sound, mainly due to the fact that it's time to be progressive in this issue, much as Europe has become progressive in this issue of becoming energy-efficient and less dependent on oil and the delivery of crude oil which seems to be resulting in periodic spillage and very deadly damage to our environment, not to mention the carbon dioxide and the heavy metals emitted into the atmosphere by the tons. Any reduction in these emissions would

be, I believe, a great boon to our health and the health of our future children.

And also I do believe that ultimately these wind farms should pretty much be up and down the coast of the country, both East and West coast, to put a severe reduction into the amount of these emissions and the amount of oil that needs to be imported into this country from war torn areas that supposedly we're fighting terrorism, but I believe that in fact that part of the battles that are going on are due to the protection of our oil reserves and any reduction in our oil would of necessity in my opinion reduce the conflicts around the world.

And also as a side to this, the jobs issue with regards to the construction of these wind turbines would be significant in contributing to the employment for construction people and maritime trades people in this area and ultimately around the country. If we proceed as they have in Europe, in Sweden, and the British Isles have said that they intend to surround the British Isles with these wind turbines due to the fact that they have suffered the same way we have with the

ecology and the emissions along with that. Thank you very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JOHN BOTTOMLY: My name is John Bottomly, and I want to congratulate and support Cape Wind for their efforts to put a wind farm in Nantucket Sound. I have installed windmills myself in the past and manufactured windmills, and the biggest problem that we faced in those days was public resistance to a new idea. There was a display in the lobby of the Brigham & Women's Hospital about the reluctance of the adoption of new ideas, and it talked about how Pasteur and then Lister and many other doctors in the Boston area were pushing for doctors to wash their hands before operating at the turn of the century, the early 1900s, and there was terrific resistance, and many, many doctors refused to wash their hands while operating, and they weren't convinced. took more than ten years to put this new technology into practice. So, I congratulate Cape Wind for tilting at windmills and I wish them great success.

AUDREY SCHULMAN: I come to this public meeting not for myself but for my children; I have

a two-year-old and a four-year-old. By the time my children are middle aged the intergovernmental panel on climate change predicts the world will have a fairly severe temperature, a fever, resulting in more extreme and variable weather around the world. New England will have more extreme droughts, heat waves, rain and snowfall and cold temperatures. There will even be more tropical diseases brought north as our climate warms.

The New England I grew up in was beautiful and a healthy place. I'd like to see the same for my children and grandchildren.

Additionally, I worry about how much oil there will be for my children's future. Almost all scientists believe the world's oil reserves are practically used up. The worldwide demand for oil is skyrocketing with China and India becoming industrialized, so, the supply is about to rapidly diminish and get more difficult to procure. If the price goes up significantly, it will have ripple effects across every sector of our U.S. society. We could end up fighting a lot more expensive and destabilizing wars in the Middle

East. I'd like my children to be able to search for their first job in a somewhat healthy environment and economy. It seems common sense to instead support American-made energy and renewable energy is the simplest and easiest way to decrease the worst excesses of global warning and the U.S.'s addiction to foreign oil.

Nantucket Sound is the windiest and most shallow sand along the U.S.'s East Coast. If the wind farm won't work here, where would it work?

The example of Cape Wind could help jump start many other U.S. offshore wind farms.

Like any mother, I want to protect my children. My life is no longer about my future but theirs. Help me protect the future for them as well as for the children you know and love. Let's be good stewards of this magnificent planet that we have inherited and that we can pass down to the next generation.

ANDREW HEAFITZ: My name's Andrew Heafitz, and I'm in favor of the Cape Wind Project. I think that this country has a -- well, we don't have much of an energy policy, and what we do have is very arrogant, selfish, and uncaring

to the rest of the world and ourselves. misuse of energy has caused a great mess in the Middle East. It causes pollution. Asthma is now one of the -- is the leading childhood disease, which is directly related to air pollution. is acid rain which kills our birds, and so on. There's global warning which is going to be a major problem in the near future. And we need to lead by example, and I don't understand how people can be opposed to this great opportunity to show what we can do with technology and moving towards renewable energy. And one of the arguments I've heard is tourism. I can say that I personally will be on the first tour boat to go out and see the wind turbines. I think that will be a great opportunity for Cape Cod, and I really hope that this project goes ahead without being interfered by selfish people who don't understand the issues.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

GLENN WATTLEY: I'm here tonight to provide comments concerning the missing ISO New England System Impact Study, the SIS. As we know, Cape Wind plans to connect the wind farm to the New England Power Grid. ISO New England, the grid operator, requires an impact study which will

identify grid modifications needed to safely transmit Cape Wind's electricity. The study will also identify the added cost of these modifications which, in my opinion, could exceed \$30 million.

During the recent Massachusetts EFSB hearings, Cape Wind and NStar represented that NStar would work with ISO New England to produce the system study. However, the system impact study, which is a critical analysis, has not been produced for public review. Until the SIS is provided, the Army Corps must consider Cape Wind's environmental and economic analysis to be incomplete and inaccurate. For example, missing costs for grid modifications means the economic benefits shown in the draft EIS are overstated.

Also, the SIS should address the need for backup power. Wind farms are intermittent generators and thus require backup generation. In the case of Cape Wind and the New England Grid, the backup power will most certainly come from fossil fuel power plants. Burning fossil fuel for backup power will produce additional pollution such as NOX and CO2. Therefore, without backup

power analysis, the net emission savings for NOX and CO2 presented in the DEIS are inaccurate and overstated. The Army Corps should not approve the final EIS until the SIS is produced for public review and public debate.

I will follow up and file a written statement with the Army Corps, addressing the need for the system impact study.

AMY TIGHE: My name is Amy Tighe. I'm a real estate agent for Coldwell Banker. I live in Somerville, Massachusetts and I want to say that I am a hundred percent in favor of the wind project for many reasons.

I think that it's -- even though I understand as a real estate agent that some people may think it devalues their property, I think that that is incorrect thinking. I think all of us need to think that sustainable sources of energy bring value to our property and we have to start thinking that way.

I'm also concerned that if this project doesn't work or if somehow we end up learning how to conserve energy and we can decrease our reliance on fossil fuel once this wind project is

put up, it can come down easily, and that's to me a key point, that this can be dismantled without causing further harm to the environment. So, if you don't like it for eight or nine years till we find other ways to deal with it, to deal with the energy issues, then we'll just take the project down. That's all I want to say. Thanks very much.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

ADAM PEPPER: As a resident of Massachusetts, I support the Cape Wind Project for a variety of reasons. Primarily, our environment needs a lot of help, and if we can get away from oil, it would be a start. Our reliance on fossil fuels is leading us into a lot of bad political and global directions. There's a complete possibility that our scientists are warning us of climate change, that they are accurate, and that we really are going to be in a lot of trouble very soon, continuing to burn fossil fuel is just exacerbating that problem. So, I wholeheartedly support Cape Wind because it's the beginning of hopefully many projects which will lead to better, safer energy sources for our country and everywhere else. Thank you.

WENDY BARING-GOULD: The reason that many people are objecting to installation of this wind farm is based on the visual impact it will have on their viewscape, and I would just like to say that any installation of any type that will generate energy will have an impact on the viewscape. Prudoe Bay changed the landscape of Alaska. ANWR would change that wildlife reserve. The oil derricks off Santa Barbara have changed the viewscape of that city. If we imagine what the visual impact of the activities in the Middle East have been in order to ensure a supply of fossil fuels from there, it's immeasurable. So, aesthetics alone cannot be the justification to stop this project because if you stop this project based on aesthetics, there will never be another energy facility built in the world. So, I strongly support the wind farm and I hope that it's approved.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PAUL REEVES: My name is Paul Reeves.

I'm President and CEO of One World Energy and

Project Director for a group called Upepo. Upepo
is Swahili for "wind," in case you didn't know.

But what we try to do in the Upepo group

is develop ownership models for people of color to participate in this renewable energy dysphoria.

One of the things -- I do support the Cape Cod

Wind Project. I think it is a very laudable

project and I think it should go forward, for a

number of different reasons, not least being the

health aspect of being able to decrease the amount

of particulates, harmful particulates in the

atmosphere.

But one of the things which I do
question is that the -- I do agree also that there
will be -- have to get some subsidies for the Cape
Cod model in order for it to exist. Now, poor
people, the Massachusetts Renewable Energy Trust,
is going to provide some of those subsidies. What
benefits are they going to directly derive from
the Cape Cod model? Is some of this energy going
to displace some of the energy going into Boston,
into Fitchburg, into some of the larger -Lawrence or Lowell, for example, which have high
populations of minorities, where you have 75
percent of children under the age of 12 having
some type of respiratory disease, and how are you
going to balance that with this project? And

that's what I'd like to know.

GREGG DAVEY: My name is Gregg Davey. I just wanted to mention that I don't think enough is being done to -- although I support the Cape Wind Project -- I don't think enough is being done to develop deep sea off limits technology which can be developed and deployed much more economically than coastal based farms.

WIG ZAMORE: My name is Wig Zamore. I am a Somerville resident of nearly 20 years but previously worked in a year-round seaweed harvest and manufacturing business in the Boothbay Harbor area of the Maine coast. I not only spent four years of my life working on the ocean, but I've also spent part of every year of my life looking across Townsend Gut at Southport Island, Rachel Carson's home, and the shore from which her ashes were cast back into the sea. I have a deep appreciation of the perils of the ocean, and also a deep appreciation of the beauty of coastlines and man's interaction with them.

I am here to offer strong support for the Cape Wind project. I would ask that its final design details, construction and operation have

reverence for the sea. We must pursue clean energy. We are the most oil- and import-dependent part of the United States. We are the largest state in the United States which is entirely in violation of the National Ambient Air Quality standard for ozone, and we have been in violation continuously since the Clean Air Act of 1970. We vie yearly for the distinction of having the highest asthma rates in the country, fully 33 percent of both national and California averages.

Somerville resident is our unparalleled lung cancer and heart attack mortality rates.

Somerville has roughly 550 lung cancer and heart attack deaths every five years, had almost exactly that number from 1996 through 2000, yet it should only have had about 400 such deaths. We had 145 more deaths over those five years from those two causes than we should have had. We have lower than average smoking rates but 29 excess and heart attack deaths per year, the most per square mile of any of Massachusetts' 351 communities. Those deaths are the direct result of combustion-related air pollution. Let's clean up our act and build

Cape Wind as a great step along that pathway.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

EDWARD E. RICE: Born on Martha's Vineyard, I've lived in Martha's Vineyard and Cambridge for my 49 years. I have two children; I'm a science teacher, public science teacher, I have two children, been scuba diving for more than 20 years, I've been fishing for 40 years plus.

What we know about things, fine and well, but what about what we don't know? It was some wise people who said, you know, they're wise because they know what they don't know. concern is for the environment and for the food chain and for the environmental impact, what the studies can't tell. There's an environmental impact on whatever you do, but they say, oh, look at the big picture, we need to start somewhere. Well, this is one little section of the richest fishing ground on the planet for centuries and, well, let's try an experiment with a wind farm there, with the sediment, the turbidity. I think it's a bad idea; find another place. I don't care about the view, that doesn't bother me. I think it's foolhardy to experiment in one of the richest fishing grounds in the world for centuries.

Students for Environmental Action from

Northeastern University, and all the major

concerns I've heard addressed from those people

opposed to Cape Wind, for the most part all I keep

hearing people complain about is the scenery, but

I would like to know where the scenery is going or

how the scenery is going to help them when their

grandchildren are choking from asthma because of

carbon monoxide emissions.

I am very in favor of Cape Wind and all alternative energy, and I think it would be a monumental step in renewable energy for this energy.

And also the concerns about birds and wildlife, bioaccumulation of chemicals in animals and wildlife, particular fish and birds that feed on fish, is phenomenally worse than the impact of the wind farm, as many of the speakers tonight have said. So, there again I'm in great support of Cape Wind and I hope it goes through.

WAYNE ECKERSON: My name is Wayne

Eckerson, from Hingham, Massachusetts. I have

never spoken at a public hearing or attended one,

but I'm here tonight because prior to Hingham I lived for ten years in Hull, in fact, at the -- all the way at the end of the Hull Peninsula where there is a wind turbine, in fact, the only one in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. When that project was being proposed there were several people in the neighborhood who opposed it because they said it would make too much noise. In fact, there still are several people who say it makes too much noise, but I am here to say that I've stood below that turbine and it makes virtually no noise at all, especially in comparison to the jumbo jets that rumble overhead on the way to Logan Airport.

Now, I point this out -- bring this up to point out the funny things that people say to resist thing that might adversely affect their lives.

With respect to the Cape Wind Project,
we've heard a lot about aesthetics. That's a
funny thing to say, I think, in this regard,
especially when it comes from our Governor's lips.
Governor Romney was not thinking about aesthetics
when he approved construction funds for the

Greenbush Rail Line, the railroad which runs right through one of Massachusetts' most historic towns, which is Hingham, and even though I opposed that project to be the right thing, standing up for the needs of the majority, best interests of a few. That's what I think Romney needs to do today. He needs to show leadership for the best interest of the Commonwealth, and to that end, I'd like to read a letter I submitted to The Boston Globe which never got published. And I'll put that into the record.

CHARLES PAXSON: My name is Charles
Paxson. I'm a Cambridge resident, Cambridge,
Massachusetts. I'm interested in wind power and
the technology of it, and consider myself an
environmentalist, and I'm very happy to know that
wind power is attempting to create renewable
energy sources for Massachusetts. Also in there
as an environmentalist, I'm a bit of a mountaineer
and rock climber and I enjoy these pristine
wilderness places just like sailors and other
people on the Cape and on the Islands might enjoy
their area.

So, taking some things that I've heard

from the session this evening concerning stewardship, and phrases also like mechanisms and how we enjoy our toys, I wish that wind power would consider incorporating the wind power into our cities. That means Boston Harbor; that means the top of our towers. I think these wind farms will be disturbing to the pristine wilderness and I'd like to see them more incorporated into our industrialization complexes as they are, thus reducing the impact to our environment, but also helping it through its clean energy. Thank you.

DAVID CONNA: My name is David Conna and I have worked in the field of energy conservation and renewable energy for the past over 20 years.

I'm here tonight to try to help put the pros and cons of building the Cape Wind Project in perspective.

Cape Wind's opponents seem to be having the world's longest sustained temper tantrum because the project would be slightly visible from the shore, and while I do respect that people who love any place would not want to see it changed, I think it's crucial that we view the changes that Cape Wind would cause in terms of the bigger

picture.

It's no secret that America's dependence on foreign oil has become a huge security problem for us, and the only true solution is to develop new domestic energy supplies combined with improved efficiency. Of all the non-polluting energy sources, wind energy is the most economically competitive today and we need to develop it aggressively.

So, when I look at the big picture, these are the questions I ask: Do we really want to go on sending our young people to the Middle East and elsewhere to kill and die in wars that any reasonable person knows are at least in part about oil? And I want to take an aside here. A lady earlier spoke of her nephew dying in Iraq and accused the Cape Wind people of using the oil issue as a reprehensible thing to do. I'm not a part of Cape Wind, I'm an individual. I believe this. I'm sorry, but I think it's true.

My second question to look at is: Do we really want to continue suffering the health and environmental effects of burning fossil fuels from asthma and lung cancer, to global warming and

rising sea levels? Do we really want to pay more and more for polluting energy sources when a clean, secure domestic source is within easy reach with numerous benefits and minimal impacts?

That's the big picture, and because I understand that, I think wind turbines are beautiful because I know they represent political and environmental progress, but even if I didn't, I would still be happy enough to look at them in exchange for cheaper, cleaner, safer energy, a healthier community, and less war. This project has been exhaustively reviewed and its merits are well established. Please use your authority to move it forward.

And I must add one other thing.

Interestingly, when I rode the subway in on the way here, I picked up a paper, today's Metro,

Thursday, December 16th. On Page 10 is an article, "Buzzards Bay oil spill hurts terns. In April 2003, just as terns were heading to their nesting grounds, an oil barge hit a rocky shoal in Buzzards Bay, spilling nearly 100,000 gallons of oil. Ram Island was heavily oiled, and to save the terns, biologists used noise cannons, strobe

lights and other devices to chase them away. A report issued by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service last month estimated that at least 350 roseate tern chicks were lost because of delayed nesting when the parent birds had to be chased away from the island. That's about ten percent of one year's production." That's a direct impact that presumably would be greatly reduced if we weren't importing as much oil and importing it through Buzzards Bay.

That's all I'd like to say. Thanks very much.

DAVID ROBINSON: My name is David

Robinson. I am a lifelong summer resident on Cape

Cod, and I strongly oppose the wind farm

development. I am an environmentalist; I want to

reduce emissions; I want to build renewable

energy. I can only hope that my children are less

dependent on foreign oil and breathe cleaner air.

This is truly a miraculous project.

From what I've heard tonight, it will cure cancer, save our brothers in Iraq, eliminate pollution, save everyone money, and increase all of our incomes. However, Cape Wind is a private company,

and let there be no mistake, their goal is to make money. We will foot the majority of the cost to build the windmills and line the pockets of the undisclosed investors at Cape Wind.

The technology is not proven and has recently failed in Denmark. Who will foot the bill for failed technology? After Cape Wind has taken their millions and filed Chapter 7, the taxpayer will have to clean up, will have to pay for the removal of the turbines and the clean-up, as we have with the pollution from the early 1950s, '60s, '70s, from failed companies. Cape Wind is desperately pushing to have the project approved before the federal government develops federal rules. These rules would likely require Cape Wind to pay for the use of land.

So, what does a group of investors who are leveraging our tax dollars do? Build a rally cry for environmentalists who will support the project without regard for the lack of developed technology, for the lack of federal legislation.

The Army Corps of Engineers has the ability or the right to control development in navigable waters. Unfortunately, they don't have

the right to make decisions about energy development offshore, such as digging for oil offshore. The loophole needs to be closed and we need to act now. Thank you.

KEVIN BLOCK-SCHWENK: For reasons many others have stated, I think Cape Wind is a great idea. Again, the choice is not between windmills and no windmills; the choice is between windmills and a dirty power plant somewhere else, possibly in Boston.

I also think that the diversity is going to benefit people throughout Massachusetts by having a cheap source of power year round into the foreseeable future.

And finally, I urge the Army Corps of Engineers to look at the actual experiences in Europe with their offshore wind farms rather than rely on speculation and unjustified fears. Thank you.

SCOTT ROBINSON: Hi. My name is Scott Robinson. My family and the Senter family have been on the Cape since the early 1940s. I'm all for wind and renewable energy; that's not my argument here. This is not just a Cape and

Islands issue or just a Massachusetts issue, or even a New England issue. This is a national issue. The decision made here will set a precedent for future projects on all U.S. coastlines. The bottom line is that there are no regulations in place for a project of this kind. Before allowing Cape Wind and its supporters to rush this project forward, I simply request that government regulations be put in place. This is a private company using public waters for free. What gives them the right? Thank you.

DAVID THAYER: I'm a student at Boston College and a lifeguard in the Town of Falmouth, Massachusetts. As someone who's dependent on the tourism industry to pay for my college education, I just wanted to support Cape Wind and say that I believe that it would only impact the tourism industry in a positive way if we could be the first — the site for the first offshore energy farm in the United States.

QUANG NGUYEN: My name is Quang Nguyen and I'm supporting Boston -- I'm representing Boston College. I'd like to address this issue of aesthetics. I think to me real beauty is not

about like whether you have pristine oceans or endless acres of blue skies. Real beauty is when humanity cares enough about the Earth that we're willing to sacrifice a little bit of that beauty to better preserve and the beauty of the Earth, and I think people take nature and natural beauty for granted and we really have to consider like how much we're harming the Earth. And when people have to work to preserve that beauty, then I think we can gain a better and deeper understanding of natural beauty. So, I think far from detracting this beauty would make many more people see how fragile and how beautiful and how precious this Earth is, and I think a great example of that is Denmark where tourism increased because when people go to see these turbines they realize the Earth is a beautiful thing and that we're working to co-exist with Earth in a way that's environmentally safe and good.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

HYUN-JOO LEE: My name is Hyun-Joo Lee.

I'm a senior at Boston College, and I'm here
wearing green with all my friends in support of
the winds project. I am a resident of Los

Angeles, California, and every time my family and

friends and I drive up to San Francisco we always look forward to the point in the trip where we can see the windmills in the valleys and in the mountains and in the desert. I know that people in California are really looking and watching this event, really rooting for the Cape Winds project. It's such a historic opportunity to move this country towards renewable energy and really make — send a message not to California and not just to the States, but to the world, that the U.S. system at its best, and I'm very excited about this event, and thank you so much for this opportunity.

Mikulski; I'm from Boston College EcoPledge. I'm speaking in support of the Cape Wind Project, and I'm wearing green to show my support. I just want to say the draft environmental impact statement brings three years of objective study that should be heavily weighed when considering the total benefits of this offshore wind farm.

One of the most important of these are the short- and long-term health benefits. For example, they cited that monetary value of

offsetting negative health effects is estimated at approximately \$53 million each year. More notably, it would estimate -- eliminate, excuse me -- 5,000 asthma attacks, 35,000 cases of upper respiratory symptoms. Originally I am from Chicago, and being in Boston, this project is a unique opportunity for the people of Massachusetts, and it's one of the reasons why I'm so excited to still be here in Boston studying for my Masters at Boston College. Natural landscapes for wind energy products from the Midwest don't have the same capacity as this project does, which is why it's so important for it to go forward.

Thank you again for hearing my comments and I look forward to hearing the final draft.

MARCUS WOODS: My name is Marcus Woods.

I'm representing Boston College. I'm wearing
green to show my support for the Cape Wind

Project. I'm originally from Colorado. I would
just like to emphasize that climate change is real
and there are a lot of fires raging throughout
entire states in the West and Midwest and the air
is so thick with smoke the sun does not shine, and
so choked with soot that breathing itself becomes

a life-threatening ordeal, it is a sign, a sign that we need to find and utilize the best alternative to dirty energy sources wherever possible.

I've come here today to speak as a sailor. I sail out of Padanaram, South Dartmouth, Massachusetts, and also out of Marion. I've sailed since before I was born; I've sailed all my life. My family were sailors for many, many generations. My parents and siblings sail out of Marion, my Grandfather sailed out of Cotuit, and my Great Grandparents out of Nantucket. And I am strongly in support of this project. I hope that you will pass it and allow the wind farm to be built.

SVEN JOSEPHSON: Sven Josephson on behalf of Tom O'Neill, former Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

The proponents of the Cape Wind have tried hard to portray this as a feel-good effort to address global warming, reduce air pollution, and create a new source of clean energy for New England. There are two problems with that description. First, it grossly overstates

potential benefits of the project; and second, it masks what this proposal's really about, which is an unprecedented land grab on the part of a private developer to take control of public property for personal gain based on the exploitation of a loophole in federal law. This is being done despite the absence of an adequate environmental review and in complete disregard for the interests of the State of Massachusetts.

As a starting point, I understand that this location, Nantucket Sound, cannot be owned, rented, or in any other way converted to private control. These lands and waters are controlled by the federal government for the benefit of all the public. It is the public that holds the property interest in this location and they should not simply be transferred to a private developer intent on making a fortune to take control of it for personal gain.

With due respect to the Army Corps supervising this process, the Section 10 permitting process is wholly inadequate for examining the comprehensive environmental and economic interests at stake. Furthermore, Cape

Wind paid for the study, and they paid for the consultants who analyzed the study, so, it should come as no surprise to anyone that those studies reflected Cape Wind's positions.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

When I was Lieutenant Governor of the Commonwealth, Massachusetts' coastline was threatened by industrial development, including a proposal to feed an oil line from Georges Bank to the Sound. We passed the first-in-the-nation Ocean Sanctuaries Act in 1981 and proposed Nantucket Sound be designated a federal marine protected area to protect our coastline from exactly the kind of development projects we're discussing this evening. This law was heralded on the editorial page of The Boston Globe as an important step in protecting "that one natural resource that's a unique object of envy by other states." The Globe also editorialized that the Sound would "remain as a rich spawning ground for ground fish and the challenges to the navigator will be only those designed by nature." How quickly we forget.

ZACK GORDON: My name is Zack Gordon.

As a young adult growing up in Massachusetts and

continuing to live in Massachusetts, I'd like to continue to live in a state where the air quality is a concern. That is why I am in favor of this project and feel that it is completely necessary to continue to care about the environment.

Thanks.

ANDREW PESEK: My name is Andrew Pesek.

I'm a resident of Cambridge and a tourist on Cape

Cod occasionally. I'd like to express my opinion

that the giving of private land for a public -
excuse me -- public land for a private development

with no compensation is against the grain of

everything we do in this country and will set a

dangerous precedent.

In terms of the effects of this project on the environment down there, one of my greatest concerns is the introduction of light pollution into the atmosphere. Since the dawn of man we've been inspired by the stars in the sky above. It's one thing that we sorely lack here in Cambridge and it's one of the things that we appreciate most about the Cape, and once the sky is gone for generations to come it will be gone forever.

Also, I'd like to submit into the

record, and I intend to do this either at this time or in the future, a climate report that suggests that wind-generating facilities are responsible for climate change, and this is something that's just come out, and I intend to introduce -- produced by Princeton University, and I intend to have that entered into the record.

And finally, we're in the dawning of a new age of high-temperature super-conducting cables which will allow power generation over great distances with minimal loss which will be perfect for large-scale wind farm construction far offshore with no impact on the neighboring community.

Thank you very much.

WERNER LOHE: My name is Werner Lohe.

I'm here speaking on behalf of Climate Change

Action Brookline. I'm also Chairman of the

Brookline Conservation Commission, and I've been a

member of the Brookline Moderator's Committee on

electricity franchising, although I'm not speaking
on behalf of either of those.

I'm going to speak about two things: economics and aesthetics. Individuals, volunteer

groups and government bodies in Brookline have been trying to find ways to provide new energy but the market hasn't responded quickly enough. We need this wind power, this wind farm, to provide the clean energy that we want. For the market to function, there needs to be a fair and prompt permitting process.

With regard to aesthetics, a number of years ago, over a decade ago, I stumbled upon a wind farm while hiking in central Massachusetts.

Last summer I went out of my way to visit a wind farm in southern Vermont. Neither of them spoiled my enjoyment of the landscape. This wind farm will not spoil Nantucket Sound. Thank you.

BARBARA BIRDSEY: My name is Barbara
Birdsey, and I have been a resident of Cape Cod
for more years than I care to admit, and I'm here
tonight as a citizen.

According to our genealogy, my family dates back to the native people that inhabited

Cape Cod prior to the arrival of the Europeans and they have a long environmental history with the

Cape. But I'm most known for my love of wildlife and wild places. Today I would like to speak for

the potential hundreds of thousands of nameless creatures who would be affected by the Cape Wind complex that cannot defend themselves.

For example, let's say that I'm a loon, perhaps one of the nearly 9,000 loons that were observed as part of the draft EIS. I have spent the spring and summer with my mate raising our two offspring on a lake in central New Hampshire. I have survived heavy boating activity, predation and pollution. In the fall I congregated with many of my own kind to rest before taking the long journey to our winter homes far out to sea. The flight to these grounds is also a challenge, but once out to sea, my time will be quiet and solitary and I will rest to know that I will return to the same lake to be reunited with my mate and to begin the whole new cycle of life when ice breaks up and spring arrives.

But right now I have finally cleared the Boston area and I am headed across Cape Cod,
Nantucket Sound, and out to sea. What a relief it is to be safe and harm free at last. But wait:
what is that ahead? It looks like another city.
So many lights shapes and noises. I don't know

where to go. Help me. Thwack. Then silence. Splash.

No one disputes that Horseshoe Shoals is part of a major flyway. This proposed project is inappropriate because of it is potentially disastrous in both size and location for wildlife. The one piece of science that we must keep foremost in our actions is the precautionary principle. Never has the risk of making a huge mistake been greater for Cape Cod and all who live there or pass through. Help us all.

JENNIFER WOLFSON: Hi. I'm Jennifer Wolfson. I live in Somerville, Massachusetts, and I'm just extremely in favor of Cape Wind, and I'm very concerned about global warming and would absolutely do anything to try and stem it, and I feel like this is a critical step for our country and that Cape Wind has to go forth.

STEPHEN FORASTE: My name is Stephen

Foraste. I currently live in Charlestown,

Massachusetts, but I grew up in Centerville on the

Cape. I've been sailing my whole life. People

believe that sailing is a rich sport, but it only

takes one rich person on each boat crewed by a lot

of other people like myself. I first raced in the Figaswi in 1979. I currently hold a Coast Guard captain's license as well as an aerospace engineering degree.

When I first heard that windmills were going to be built in Horseshoe Shoals I was very excited. Windmills combine all the best elements of technical advances, clean energy at minimal impact, aesthetics. And as anyone that's returned from the Figaswi can attest, knowing about Horseshoe Shoals is a very important thing.

Being an engineer and environmentalist, I sought more information. What I read horrified me. One hundred and thirty windmills, a wind farm, in waters up to 45 feet deep. Cape Cod and the Islands are a Class 6 wind source and I understand that these should be built there, but this project is not being built on Horseshoe Shoals. For fishermen, a shoal is water less than five feet deep. For sailors, a shoal is water less than ten feet deep. The majority of the wind farm depicted on page 7 in this public notice is located in navigable waters which the Army Corps of Engineers is responsible for managing. These

waters are not just a regional or national treasure, but a true world wonder, and so World Magazine rated Nantucket Sound one of the ten best places to sail in the world, compared with Cape Hattaras, Hawaii, the British Virgin Islands, and Sardinia.

The equivalent to this bait-and-switch is a proposal to place solar cells on the top of buildings in Boston and instead covering the Boston Common.

Cape Wind claims that a project of this magnitude is required to be profitable. The European offshore wind farms that are held out as examples are a quarter of magnitude smaller. So far there's only been one small wind project off Arklow Bank off the coast of Ireland that has used these G.E. 3.6 megawatt wind turbines. There are only seven of them, comprising a total of 25 megawatts. This project was completed only one year ago and only other of these 3.6 megawatt turbines exists, on land in Spain, built in 2002.

If we correlate back to where wind power has come, back in the 1980s wind turbines were only a hundred kilowatts in size. Now the most

popular one in the world is 1.5 megawatts in size and this new design, not thoroughly tested, is already up to 3.6 megawatts. At the rate we're going, these turbines will soon be at ten megawatts. If I applied that to Nantucket Sound, back in the 1980s, for a project of this size, 454 megawatts, would have taken 4,500 wind turbines, and I don't think anyone would agree to putting that in Nantucket Sound. A few years ago, using the 1.5 megawatt turbines, it would only take 303 towers. Today, they're proposing, with 3.6 megawatt turbines, 130 towers. And in my time line I can see 10 megawatt towers which would only take 45 wind turbines.

Well, 45 wind turbines is something I can live with. 45 wind turbines can fit on the actual Horseshoe Shoal, which was the title of this project. So, I propose that this project be assessed and only be approved on a small scale, phase one, a small number of windmills, not a wind farm. I think it's time for Cape Wind to live up to their headlines, not their fine print. I approve of windmills on Horseshoe Shoal; I do not approve of a wind farm covering Nantucket Sound.

Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

EDWARD BURKE: My name is Edward Burke, and I'm a resident of Edgartown. I have concerns about the wind farm in that the view that everybody is talking about as far as obstructed views will impact the basic people, the everyday person who goes to Martha's Vineyard on vacation with his family. It will have no impact on the wealthy people who live on the other side of the island. All of the public beaches, and there are very few of them on Martha's Vineyard which face Nantucket Sound, will face the wind farm. view from any of these beaches that will be populated by the average Massachusetts citizen, the average person coming to the Vineyard for a one-week or a two-week vacation, their view will be of the wind farm.

I think that a wind farm is a very appropriate use to try and get alternative energy. I just think that Nantucket Sound is the wrong location. And I also think that this should be woven into some kind of national plan for the use of the oceans, that we don't need to be on the cutting edge only to be the laughing stock further

down the road.

I think the issue that very much concerns me about this is the fact that this is a for profit company that is utilizing national property, national land, at no cost to them, there's a hundred percent profit on the return from the land. So, please take a look at what you want to do and subject it to further study, further scrutiny, and I hope that you make an enlightened decision. Thank you.

JEROME VIGIL: My name is Dr. Jerome

Vigil, formerly of the Energy Lab at MIT. I'm now
the CEO of two corporations. I have a summer home
on Nantucket Island and I'm dead set against this
project, and the reason being simple as this, as
an engineer and scientist I understand that the
technology that Cape Wind and General Electric are
purporting to provide, but what we all don't
understand as citizens of America is that this is
all about money. In the '80s we had an oil
shortage and the government attempted or started
to utilize coal as a viable source of energy, and
when the price of oil went down they stopped with
the coal research and the project like I was

working on, simulating magnetoized dynamic generators and seeing what kind of energy we can get from them was put on the back burner. That's what our economy is all about and capitalism.

My thesis is this: I'm not necessarily against alternative energy, but I am against the profit of a few as compared to many. What I would recommend highly is that everybody that would be a rate-payer involved in the Cape and Islands Power wind project would have stock in Cape Wind or whatever entity was developed to provide power there. It just does not make sense that an entity can get use of land or ocean land for free and also get government subsidies to build something that they're going to benefit for. It's all about the money, it's all about oil. Thank you.

I've lived in Falmouth on Cape Cod for 34 years and before that my parents started coming to the Cape in 1940. And I think that the hearings today have minimized the impact and the importance of Nantucket Sound to the entire economy and to the people who live on the Cape. I live about 20 minutes from the water and so the issue of how

this project would look from shore is completely unimportant to me.

I'm a new boater, and I think that the testimony of the Steamship Authority Captain about the difficulty that the project would pose to navigation in a very crowded area where there are many, many boats, both commercial fishing and recreation and Steamship Authority, creates a real hazard. It's extremely difficult to navigate in fog and haze to begin with. This is a 24 acre (sic) project which has roughly 130 towers the size of the Statue of Liberty, and this should be studied an awful lot more before it goes forward. If it turns out to be economically viable and it turns out to be protective of the interests I just mentioned, then perhaps it could go forward, but I don't think that enough study has been done.

BRYAN SHEEHAN: My name is Bryan

Sheehan, a private citizen, speaking as a private

citizen from Southborough, Massachusetts, with no

affiliation with any organization or the Cape Wind

Project.

Massachusetts once again has an opportunity to stand up and lead the country to a

better future. Prices for fossil fuels like oil and natural gas continue to rise. America is more dependent than ever on foreign sources for oil and natural gas, which is a very uncomfortable position to be in at this time of increased international tension. Oil, coal and natural gas provide roughly 80 percent of our country's needs and they have severe negative impacts, such as the greenhouse gas emissions that lead to global climate change, mercury emissions that are poisoning our water and fish, asthma attacks growing at exorbitant rates, and increasing health care costs to society.

Even if we could look past or instantly overcome these terrible impacts, which we can't, we would have another problem: these fossil fuels are finite and they are being depleted at such a rapid rate that we will be facing an energy supply crisis of potentially unprecedented magnitude sooner than we would like to have.

Massachusetts, our nation, and the world needs another alternative in order to secure a safe, healthy and sufficient energy future for us and our children, and as mentioned, Massachusetts

has the opportunity to once again lead the country. The Cape Wind Project represents a very significant step forward in pursuit of renewable sustainable energy. In addition to the direct benefits of enough power to renewably supply three-quarters of all the homes and businesses on Cape Cod, it offers the indirect benefit of providing other states and locales the example of what a commitment to this excellent source of renewable energy looks like and the benefits it can provide.

A one-sentence summary of the Army Corps of Engineers' environmental impact survey could be stated as: "The fact that the potential negative impacts of the project would be minimal and temporary, while the potential positive impacts would be significant and long lasting." This report was comprehensive, covering all areas of ocean geology, meaning the ocean bottom, the ocean surface, water conditions, air conditions, sea mammals, birds, and fish, and also terrestrial effects, effects to the views, noise, transportation, and navigation and many more, and did conclude again that the potential negative

impacts are extremely minor and the potential positive impacts are extremely positive.

There are only two potential negative impacts that could legitimately be said to rise above the level of minimal so they warrant a closer look. The first is potential displacement or some small amount of bird deaths because of the turbines, but the study estimates an extremely small occurrence of that and, even if it was magnified by the order of 100, it would still be a minute fraction of birds that are actually killed by existing structures that we use every day today, such as office buildings and automobiles.

Another, and possibly the only real objection that has been raised by most people, is obstruction of views, and to those people I would say the following: first, we must admittedly remain vigilant about preserving the Earth's beautiful places, but we must also weigh the alternatives and also look beyond our own self-interests. We must not imbue the selected site with an exaggerated sense of its purity. While I am as interested as anyone in preserving our great remaining wilderness places, we must

recognize the area of Nantucket Sound in question is not a pristine wilderness as has been claimed, but rather, a beautiful but already human-impacted area in which often polluting commercial and recreational boating as well as commercial fishing and lobstering currently took place which brings into question the argument against any private gain being obtained from these waters.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I also would disagree strongly with those who dislike the appearance of the wind turbines. I'm sure anyone who has seen the ugliness and devastation of an oil spill like the one last week off Alaska's Aleutian Islands, or the ugliness and pollution of oil derricks or the act of blowing the top off of a mountain to get at the coal and meeting that mountaintop in the nearest stream, will agree that the wind turbines are beautiful, not only by comparison, but in their own right. Modern wind turbines have been called the breeze made visible and have a sculptural beauty not only in their physical form but in what they stand for. They look like pieces of beautiful modern sculpture turning quietly, symbolizing a new responsible energy freedom that

we can be proud of, taking us to the future and at the same time connecting us to our past when people lived closer to the natural world. We should obviously not fill the ocean and land with them, but if they are made to step as lightly as possible on our planet, the step forwards will far outweigh the potential downsides.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

It is clear that we will need new sources of energy in the future, and the installation of any type of energy production facility has some impact, but the potential negative impact of the Cape Wind Project are very low, especially compared to the construction or operation of traditional energy production facilities. They can be characterized as minor, benign, and temporary, while the downsides of traditional fossil fuel facilities on land or sea are massive, scarring, and permanent. If we do not begin using facilities like Cape Wind, we will need to build more of the latter somewhere. minor, benign, and temporary nature of potential downsides of the Cape Wind Project combined with its extraordinary positive potential upsides make it a project that must go forward. Our state,

nation, and world are at a crossroads. At a time in which something must be done to establish a safe, healthy, renewable, secure, and independent supply, the Cape Wind Project is an extremely significant positive step forward on this path and will not only provide safe, clean, renewable energy to a large portion of our fellow citizens, but will also provide an example to the rest of the nation and may impact on a commitment to create a better world.

Over 200 years ago, Massachusetts led
the way in establishing independence for this
country at a time when many weren't sure they were
ready for it yet or that they would be able to be
successful at it. Now, once again, Massachusetts
has the chance and the responsibility to lead this
country to a new type of independence,
independence from foreign oil and from potentially
devastating long-term impacts of reliance on
polluting and finite fossil fuels.

We must remain informed, involved, and diligently aware of the Cape Wind Project to ensure that it proceeds with the highest level of care for the local environment and its

inhabitants, but we must move forward. I urge the Army Corps of Engineers, our private citizens, and public officials to support the approval, installation, and operation of the Cape Wind Project so that we can take this great step forward towards a sustainable energy future.

ANNE LARSEN: Hi. My name is Anne
Larsen. I live at 126 Atlantic Avenue in Hull,
Massachusetts, and I want to speak in strong
support of the Cape Wind Project.

In Hull, we may not have as many mansions per capita as Nantucket or as many yachts, but we still think our views are precious and valuable and unique, and as unique as those that are in Nantucket Sound. From my house — allow me to talk about two views I have, and the first is from my house, and my house is right on the water and I look across Massachusetts Bay and it's a beautiful, beautiful view, and it makes my life so much better to be living near the ocean.

But as I look across Massachusetts Bay,
I see the coal-burning plant in Salem, I see the
smokestacks, and I see the smoke rising up into
the air and spreading from those stacks over this

beautiful area with the blue sky and the ocean, and that plant is continuously spewing particulate into the atmosphere, polluting our environment, and causing increased rates of asthma, shortening the lives of our children and our elders. We have got to stop making our energy in this dirty way. It is not right for us to do it and we have it within our power to stop.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The second view I have is one as I come home from work from Boston by ferry, and as we move towards Hull I see a beacon, it's a beacon of light and hope from Hull Wind One. It's our first turbine and it's the only turbine that is currently on the coast of the eastern United States, producing power in a non-polluting way, and when I look at that windmill as I'm heading towards Hull, I'm filled with pride, because my community stepped up to the plate, took action and did something, and it did it before anyone else had the guts to do it. Anyone who wants to can come to Hull and see that wind turbine, they can stand right under it, it's sited right on land, right next to our high school, it's right next to the football field, and it doesn't pollute our

environment and it doesn't pollute our view. It makes us a better community. And the majority of people in Hull feel that, and we're coming up to the third anniversary of its operation.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I'm filled with pride because Hull did this, and we've done something to ensure one of our most precious resources, and that is the lives of our children and our grandchildren. The Army Corps of Engineers report gives specific figures to document the cost of continuing to depend on polluting sources of energy, 53 million dollars a year in health costs, but my concern is more immediate and specific. I want the children I love not to get asthma unnecessarily. I want the husband I love not to have respiratory problems, which he has, that threaten to shorten our time together. These are my precious resources and I want the Army Corps of Engineers and this country to pay attention to those resources and to take action now to begin to protect them rather than somebody's views.

I want to say something else, and that is that we are now in the midst of a war in Iraq and the poor of this country are sending their

children over to die, to be mutilated, and to kill others, and the reason we're there is to protect our access to cheap oil to power our way of life. That is a shame on our country, and I urge the Army Corps of Engineers to take action and to allow this project to move forward and to make our country the kind of country that won't let that happen.

Mitt Romney talks about the view and the pristine area of Nantucket, and I ask what kind of country are we if the rich are not even asked to give up their scenic views while the poor are giving up their children.

Thank you very much.

ROMEO DESMARIS: My name is Romeo

Desmaris. I'm a member of the Local 103 in

Boston, I'm an electrician. And I just wanted to

give my comment. I worked out of the Local 223 in

Brockton and I worked at that power plant at

Brayton Point in Somerset and I was on the night

shift, we were putting on the fourth smokestack,

it's the biggest one they have there, they've got

three about the same height, but we were working

on the biggest one, and at two o'clock at night a

loud noise went on, it was like a big horn going off, and I said, what was that? And he says, well, they're blowing out the smokestacks, and he says, take a look out the window. And I looked out the door and they had the soot going out all up in the air and it was going over the town of Fall River across the water and I live in -- two towns away. Somerset and Swansea is always affected also which way the wind blows at night. And I said, how long does this go on? And he said, every night, they do it at two o'clock so people sleeping don't know what's going on. And I says to me that's bad because when you get the fourth one on line it just raises it up higher and if it rains at night it's still going to come down, you know, probably come down even further depending on which way the wind's blowing.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

To me, this new Cape Wind Project, the people got to realize, if we lose power in the house, everybody wants their TV on, their kids are going crazy. We need electricity. Places are, you know, building houses all over and the Cape is getting bigger every year. We need more power; we gotta get it somewhere. We gotta look at the new

generation. Nobody wants a nuclear plants. I've worked in nuclear plants; they have leaks. You go home, you grab your kids, you got nuclear waste on you. If you grab the kids when you're coming in, they get contaminated.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I refused to work in the Pilgrim Power Plant because of that. And I said, the one down to Brayton Point's got coal. I said, they wanted us to go in the hole once to clean the porcelain. They opened up the hatch and the soot come out and they told us get in there and clean the stuff, this won't harm you, you'll just get dirty. we had a company come in and test it and they said there was over a million particles per whatever they call it, and he said it would have been enough to kill you within an hour. And he says, they were telling you to work in that atmosphere? I says, yeah, they said either do that or go home, you're not getting paid. I said, we refused to do it and we protested and they finally got a company to test the air and the air quality was bad. he said, what do you think's going in the air at night? And I said, we can see it going on now and I says, I'm glad I was only there for about two

months working on that because I refused to even go back there again to work there on any shift on the new extension.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, I just wanted people to know, the best alternative, we've got to get electric somewheres that's clean, the wind plant that they're putting up, and I suggest that if people look at it and it's the least of all evils, you know. Sure, just the view, I'd rather look at windmills six -- or four miles out in the water. I go by the power plant at Brayton Point and talk about and eyesore, and they've got a 50-foot high Now, who wants to go driving by and pile of coal. those -- when that soot goes off, the people that live in the area, they have their clothes hanging out in the summertime and it corrodes all the clothes and they're bringing them in and they pay them and they say, all right, keep your mouth shut, you're all set. I says, what good is that? Instead, you see the visible of that on clothes, imagine what's happening to people who live in the area if it's coming in through their windows at nighttime or the air-conditioning and that stuff.

The people should realize this is the

best alternative. As far as I'm concerned they should pass it and get started and show America that we can do something, move forward with the right technology that we have. All right. Thank you.

RICHARD A. KRAUS: My name is Richard A. Kraus. I'm a lifetime Cape Cod resident of 56 years, having been raised in Hyannisport and Weymouth and now living in West Barnstable. I have made my living for the past 30 years in the shellfish/aquaculture business on Cape Cod. Through my business I have both long-term and firsthand knowledge of many of the bays and harbors of Cape Cod. I also have firsthand knowledge of Horseshoe Shoals through my days of recreational fishing on the shore during the 1970s and '80s during which time I made approximately 60 trips to the shoals.

Based on my knowledge and what I believe are the proper policies a company should be following, I would like to make the following observations on the proposed wind farm.

I have never observed either sailboating or commercial fishing activity on the shoals. Due

to the shallow and shifting nature of the shoals, it is not a prime spawning ground for fish and is not a good shellfish habitat. The shoal, to the best of my knowledge, is primarily a habitat for migratory fish such as bluefish and striped bass. It would seem unlikely that any of the existing resources of the shoals would in any significant way be harmed by the wind farm.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Starting my shellfish/aquaculture business, we went through many of the same opposition themes as those faced by Cape Wind. also were confronted by heavy opposition to our shellfish farms with claims that our proposed business was going to depress shoreside property values, damage the local tourism industry, and cause environmental damage to the marine environment. With the backing of the State of Massachusetts, we eventually prevailed and as it turned out none of the claims of harm came true. Our business subsequently spawned an environmentally friendly industry that now brings in approximately \$10 million annually for the Cape Cod economy and, most importantly, provides a means by which local fishermen can earn sufficient income to be able to afford to live in their very own towns.

The shellfish aquaculture business in Massachusetts is built to prosper in a relatively clean, stable marine environment. The animals that we raise have evolved over tens of thousands of years to prosper in this environment.

Based on scientific evidence, the overwhelming majority of the world's scientists believe that unless we reduce our burning of fossil fuels we will significantly change our environment. These changes, sea level rise, temperature rise, amongst others, will have a profound effect on the coastal ecosystem over a very short period of time. I and many others depend on our near shore marine ecosystems for our livelihoods. Given our current scientific knowledge, we must encourage non-polluting renewable energy sources whenever possible.

Personally, I feel strongly that it is in our country's and Cape Cod's best interests to allow Cape Wind to proceed with the wind farm on Horseshoe Shoals. We need clean, non-polluting energy sources; we need to reduce our dependence

on foreign countries. I strongly believe that once the wind farm is built and people see that the actual repercussions of the wind farm are minimal, that it will serve to propagate offshore wind power development throughout the East Coast.

I have read the Army Corps' Executive Summary of the Draft EIS and have no significant differences with its findings. The Cape Wind Project will have a significant bearing on our country's future and I sincerely hope that it comes to fruition. I thank the Army Corps, especially the First District, for continuing to be a highly professional and objective agency to the citizens of the United States. Thank you.

DUGAN HAYES: As a resident of Cape Cod, I was completely shocked by the Wind Farm debate. It frightens me to think there is actually genuine opposition to such an environmentally responsible proposition. So, we're supposed to consider, as the Army Corps of Engineers asked us to, whether it in the public interest. So, now, the continued support of oil companies certainly isn't what I call the public interest. Everyone knows that our dependence on foreign oil has placed us in serious

political jeopardy, but we mustn't also forget that corporate giants such as Exxon, Mobil and Texaco, are some of the biggest violators of human rights in the world today. It's easy to sit on Cape Cod and complain about some wind turbines several miles offshore while entire villages in Nigeria and Indonesia are forcibly and often violently displaced year round for the construction of pipelines, but instead we could just as easily embrace alternative energy that is both environmentally and socially friendly.

To those who would ask Wind Farm supporters not to use soldiers in Iraq as a selling point, I would like to remind them that our own corporations are responsible for killing those in Third World countries whose only crimes have been to inhabit oil-rich regions under governments that are supported financially by the companies that we will continue to support until we diversify our energy sources.

But the people that surprise me the most are those who object to the wind farm because of its appearance. Not only will the sight of the turbines be negligible, but we have adapted to the

site of power lines and utility poles throughout our towns which are far more intrusive. The sprawling estates that already decorate Nantucket Sound are, in my opinion, a far more offensive sight.

Furthermore, if we continue to deplete our stores of energy without seeking an alternative, we will soon be forced to forfeit much larger natural resources by inflicting the irreparable damage of drilling.

As a Cape Cod resident, I would be proud to say that my home is progressive in terms of alternative energy. I've heard many people say, "I support wind energy but only wind energy done right." It seems impossible to me to have any objection to something as necessary as clean, renewable energy, and I fail to see how a project that will have virtually no negative environmental impact is wrong. On the contrary, the significant reduction in the emission of greenhouse gasses and sulphides into our atmosphere and mercury into our drinking water would be much more beneficial. It may seem like a small step toward the elimination of dependence of fossil fuels to construct the

wind farm, but it's a step in the right direction. We have to start somewhere, and somewhere as unobtrusive as Nantucket Sound sounds like a great place to me.

MALCOLM BROWN: Hello. I'm Malcolm

Brown. I'm a resident of Hull, Massachusetts. I

live at 126 Atlantic Avenue in Hull.

I've been for a long time an advocate of the increase in the capturing of wind power in our Commonwealth. I was certainly very active in getting the Hull Municipal Light Board, of which I'm now a member. I'm not speaking for the Light Board; I'm speaking for myself. I was one of the first in getting our Light Board to move forward and put in Hull Wind One, as we call it.

I'm also enthusiastic about our current process that's currently going on to get Hull Wind Two established at our landfill in the Town of Hull, and further to permit a set of up to four offshore wind turbines which would be about one or two miles offshore in shallow water, so, they would be a bit closer to our citizens onshore than Cape Wind's turbines which I gather, at the closest are three or four miles away, but a bit

more visible, as one of the speakers tonight said.

Our Hull Wind One is very, very visible, and our

Hull Wind Three, Four and Five will be very

visible.

I support the view that a little bit of visibility is vastly to be preferred to the health consequences and the other -- the geopolitical damages that it does to us to be too dependent on oil and on foreign oil in particular. So, I am very strongly in support of the Cape Wind Project being approved and going forward and being a source of pride to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, the way we think in Hull, our current wind projects are a source of pride to Hull. Thank you very much.

ALAN CARRIER: My name is Alan Carrier.

I'm a Cape Cod property owner in Orleans,

Massachusetts, and my daughter, who's six years

old, Camille Gibbons, lives there, and I'm

concerned for her future and that's why I'm here

tonight. I feel that it's of utmost importance

that the wind farm be approved as submitted so

that my daughter's energy future will be secure in

the United States of America. I feel that we

should not be beholden to foreign powers and fanatical regimes to obtain our energy, and that the Cape Cod wind power -- wind farm project is of utmost importance for our long-term energy independence and national security.

I would like to urge the Army Corps to approve this without further delay so the project may continue forward and establish a motivator to other investors to open wind farms throughout the United States, offshore and onshore, to create energy independence for Americans so that we can have jobs at home and not wars overseas. I would hate to see my daughter have to wear a uniform to defend foreign regime's oil just so we have the right to purchase it at \$250 a barrel.

I feel that the wind power is the future and possible hydrogen energy from wind power is also an option so we may even be able to switch over our homes to electric heat if the cost were to come down enough from enough wind power production in the United States. This way we could become fully independent of oil and move forward. A very primitive energy source, oil, and wind is a very futuristic energy source, and I

think that the people must be taken care of forthwith and the national security interests of the United States and our energy future and the future of our children and grandchildren. Thank you.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

JOERAMA VALIANTI: What I would say if I got up there was that, you know, first of all, thank you to the Corps of Army -- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers for such a thorough process, and thank you to all the opponents for raising so many issues that should be scrutinized and looked at, and thank you to Cape Wind, thanks to the proponents, of course, and thank you to Cape Wind especially for sticking with this process. It's been an arduous process for them, I know, it's been three years already, probably be another couple years before it goes on line, and I hope and pray that it does go on line because we need it. We're already 30 or 40 years behind in our energy needs, and I think it's crucial that we get this going.

I also welcome having a windmill in my back yard. I would love to have a windmill. I live in Watertown. I would love to see a windmill

on the Oakley Country Club, top of the hill. I would love to have a windmill on Cape Cod, and in the Fresh Pond Reservation where I run, I would not mind at all. I would see it as a beautiful, beautiful site as a testament to our doing something about the environmental state that we're in.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We will all reap the benefits of this, and we all enjoy Cape Cod's view. We're all from Cape Cod. We've all spent time at Cape Cod. I've been going to Cape Cod since I was a little boy. We've had family vacations on Cape Cod in Orleans, and in Orleans Rock Harbor they have some things that might not be looked at as real beautiful, they have these dead trees in Rock Harbor that stick up out of the ocean floor to guide boats so they can know, because it's so shallow or whatever, they need to go down a certain channel, they have these dead trees. Goes out about a mile or so. People might think, oh, dead trees, those don't look too great, do they. We actually -- my father and I and people -- we actually look at them and think, wow, that's pretty good, pretty good use of dead trees. We see it as a beautiful

thing.

And also it's one of the most beautiful places to watch the sunset, Rock Harbor, with a calypso band playing, as a lot of people down the Cape know. I don't mind seeing these dead trees stick out of the water because they're there for the greater good, they're there for these boats to come in and out of the harbor safely. So, I won't mind seeing -- if I can even see them -- these windmills, way, way, way out in the distance. I probably won't see them most of the time. 4.7 miles from the Cape, nine miles from Martha's Vineyard, three miles from Nantucket, they probably won't be seen most of the time from Martha's Vineyard or Nantucket, maybe from the Cape occasionally.

But, like a woman just said, it's not our view, it's the vision. Do we have the vision to go forward? This is something that should be celebrated. Cape Wind should be thanked.

I also used to live in California and I traveled to the hills of California where they have windmills, and to me they were beautiful. I loved seeing windmills in California, and it was,

again, a testament to what we can do for renewable energy resources.

A friend of mine is a native of Curacao, he just came back a little while ago. He said, oh, they have windmills there right near the airport. I said, oh, what do you think about them? He said, actually, they were very nice, they were beautiful, I thought they were great, and they were so silent, they were going a lot slower than I would have imagined. I thought -- I didn't think they were an eyesore at all, I thought they were pretty cool.

And we've already heard from the people from -- that have gone to Denmark and the gentleman who's from Denmark. Pretty cool.

They're pretty proud of it.

I think it's a matter of how we look at it, how do we choose to look at this issue. It reminds me of the cellular phones in the towers. When we need cell phones, we have to put up towers for those cell phones, and whenever you see someone wanting to put up a new tower, you see signs all over the neighborhood saying, "No cell tower in my neighborhood, no cell tower in my

neighborhood." Well, I can guarantee you, 90 percent of those people us cell phones. Okay? 90 percent of those people who have signs saying "No cell towers" have cell phones that they rely on but they don't want cell towers in their back yard. Okay? Prime example. These people don't want windmills in their back yard. Well, I'm sorry, they're going to go somewhere, we've got to do something, please, fine, put them in my back yard, they've got to go somewhere and they're going to be.

And to the woman who had a relative that died in Iraq that was very, very hurt, felt kicked in the stomach, my heart goes out to her, and I also say it is all connected, yes, Cape Wind using the Iraq war as a way to kind of persuade people, I'm sorry, it's a fair analogy, it's a fair connection to draw. We are all connected. Our administration's lack of vision, the lack of energy policy on this had led us down the wrong path, okay? To some very bad decisions on our administration's part that has to do with oil and foreign reliance on oil and getting us into Iraq, and I'm sorry, but it is connected, it's all

connected.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We're also already 30 or 40 years behind in this energy thing, and it reminds me of a quote that I just saw at the Tree Warden's office, Conservation Commission, Watertown, Massachusetts. The quote said, "The best time to plant a tree is 20 years ago. The next second best time to plant a tree is today." Okay? So, the best time to start thinking about renewable energy resources and actually doing something about it was 30 or 40 years ago, and had not John F. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy been assassinated, we would have had a much different world to live in right now, but unfortunately, God rest them, they were taken from That set us back, that set our environment back 30, 40 years, and I'm sorry, Ted Kennedy might not agree, but you're wrong, Ted Kennedy, on this issue. I agree with most everything you stand for, but on this issue you are dead wrong, I'm sorry. You are wrong on this issue. And so, anyways, the best time -- the

And so, anyways, the best time -- the best time for our renewable energy policy was 30, 40 years ago; the next best time, the second best time for us to do something for renewable energy

is today, so, we cannot delay any longer, let's get going, let's get off our ass, this is bigger than all of us, we have to think about the greater good, we have to think about the Earth as a sacred place to live. Yes, think beyond our narrow self-interest and look beyond to the greater good, please. Thank you.

HENRY WOOD: I am Henry Wood. I'm speaking for myself here. I'm a resident of Boston. I strongly support the Cape Wind Project and commend the Corps of Engineers for their exhaustive EIS.

I think almost certainly I have the oldest offshore wind farm in the country. It's only one windmill on a tiny island off the entrance to Narragansett Bay, but it has provided all the electricity for our house for the last 35 years and we are planning to get an electric boat to get to shore. It is about a hundred feet high from the ocean level there, which is a much higher angle of visibility than any of the Cape Wind Projects. We have had boats going by there for the full 35 years; no one has ever complained about the appearance of our windmill.

On a different subject, several huge ships come by loaded to the gunnels with coal. They go up the bay to Brayton Point, which takes three million tons of coal a year to satisfy The Brayton Point we've heard a bit about here already, but let me give you the figures that the Harvard School of Public Health came up on a survey they did on the impact of the emissions from just this plant. They are -- they estimate that there will be premature death of 106 people each year. There will be emergency calls because of the asthma or other things, eleven hundred and forty of those. No, I'm sorry. That's eleven hundred and forty going to the emergency department of hospitals in order to assuage their problems.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

There will also be asthma. We've heard a lot about that, but there will be asthma attacks of some magnitude 28,900 people. There will also be upper respiratory incidents of 152,000 a year. I compare this to my possible one seagull that's killed a year from my offshore plant. Thank you.

MICHAEL CHARNEY: My name is Dr. Michael

MICHAEL CHARNEY: My name is Dr. Michael Charney. I'm following up on comments that I

began during the session. My general point is is that the DEIS as written does not take advantage of the fact that it should be incorporating climate benefits specifically within virtually every environmental issue area, and there are some very easy and specific ways to do this given that the contribution by Cape Wind altering each of these major categories in Section 5 is minimal or zero, whereas every comparable alternative power source, whether it's nuclear or fossil fuel or waste incineration would have adverse impact in some parts of the environment, many of which are included in the current assessment.

I also wish to state that I think that future DEIS studies or environmental impact studies should all subject all future power sources to similar scrutiny regarding their climate impacts and their specific implications in each of the category areas. And as an example, or as examples, I'd like to go through a number of them.

First, it is acknowledged that there are significant SOX NOX particulate, CO2, mercury, heavy metal and particulate I mentioned, outlets

from power plants which will be forgone with Cape Wind, and and each of these has its implications that also need to be indicated as forgone or non-occurring harms, harms that will not occur, and, therefore, as a clean power source you can then describe specifically how various aspects of their current report would not be impacted, whereas a natural gas, coal, oil, nuclear or continued use of any such existing facilities would continue to disturb many of these same category areas.

The water depth will change dramatically, for example, not just one to three feet, which is predicted for the next century, but it is also quite likely that either the Greenland ice sheet or the Western Antarctic ice sheet will melt and/or fall into the sea. It should be noted that there already have been major breakoffs in Antarctica and that the Arctic ice cover is thin more than 40 percent and is destined to be eliminated perhaps by the end of the century.

Greenland is developing similar pooling of water in its surface and crevices and water runoff, similar to the kinds of antecedent events

which then will follow by the breakoff of those major chunks of the shelf in Antarctica over the last several years. So, and if either of those the Greenland ice sheet or the West Arctic shelf were to break off and go into the ocean, that's the equivalent of six meter, six meter water sea level rise, and that should be indicated. Cape Wind will not precipitate that and any other fossil -- any fossil-fuel power plant will contribute to that.

Waves, the greenhouse effect is increasing energy in the meteorologic system of the planet and so waves are going to increase with wind velocity and other intensity of storms.

Water quality will be impacted adversely by climate change on the Cape and other places with rising sea level, you're going to lose clean aquifer, and so, water quality, which is not addressed I think appropriately, for drinking purposes, is not being addressed appropriately in the EIS and that it should be emphasized that Cape Wind would not adversely impact water quality through sea level rise and salinization of the aquifer.

2 unspecified ways due to continued sea level --3 excuse me -- global temperature increase and, in fact, was well known and feared would be a disruption of the thermal haline circulation which 5 is well described in the IPPC reports and can be 6 7 easily incorporated here should the Gulf Stream 8 shut down. We are, of course, going to see major climactic impact on all our ecosystems and our 9 10 society, and this may not happen in the first 11 hundred, but it well could happen in the next 12 several hundred years, and I think that we must 13 include that fear and that likelihood as science 14 is now seeing that and there are some very scary

signs happening, and this was the basis of the

thermal haline circulation conveyor belt.

Pentagon study worst case with the shutdown of the

Water currents are going to change in

1

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

pH is changing in the oceans, and that's also changing phytoplankton density which is at the root of the food chain in the oceans, and fossil fuel plants, as you state, emit SOX and NOX and carbon dioxide which are, in fact, acidifying the top layers now of the ocean and eventually will acidify the rest of it over the next 2000

years, and that could well kill all phytoplankton which could lead to the further collapse of the sea food chain.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Sediment, of course, will be stirred up by the more violent storms that are being predicted. Hurricanes, while perhaps not more frequent, are predicted to become much larger and more intense than before with global climate change as we rev up the energy system of the planet. This is documented, and you can rest assured that that will cause greater storm surges that will exceed your current estimate of hundred year floods and hundred year storm surges by many factors, and that you're going to see massive pollution events as human installations along the coast are damaged by these major storms, should we have, for example, another hurricane '38 which we're long overdue for and which with climate change we can expect, at least if not here, then further up and down the New England coast.

Bioaccumulation, of course, is important with fossil fuel and nuclear sources, and those have already been moving into in other areas, but you don't emphasize that birds, cats, dogs,

cattle, plants are afflicted also by ozone, SOX, NOX, and that Cape Wind will not produce such impacts.

Again, these are negative findings that are benefits, positive or good impacts of Cape Wind and they are not receiving attention in detail in specific places or in your executive summary.

And in an aside here, you mention that 4,500 years ago when the climates stabilized, but you didn't go on to say that in the last hundred years, or fifty years in particular, humanity is destabilizing the planet due to our reliance on fossil fuel, and I think a forward-looking perspective would include that.

Our shoreline, of course, is going to be impacted; I've already alluded to that. The marshlands and the wetlands along the coast, both fresh water and salt water, are going to be wiped out by sea level rise predictably. Oil spills have been addressed by other organizations. You haven't mentioned polar bears, and they are part of our extended planet, but they are really our charismatic metaphor symbolizing the 30 percent of

known flora -- of known -- of biodiversity that is destined to be destroyed as a result of global climate change according to a recent British study.

Emergency Management Planning, I don't see anything, maybe I missed it, in the report about how Cape Wind would not escalate the risk of a major disaster such as these hurricanes or ice storms or Nor'easters, that it may be revved by the vagaries and uncertainties in the energizing of the global atmosphere due to temperature rise.

I think you have to indicate that there are going to be expenses in having to meet climate change, whether it's going to be defending -- having water barriers or dikes and so forth, what we're going to do about marshes up and down the New England coast, not to mention Logan Airport and other low-lying parts of Boston. You haven't, and I think you should, include a map of the major areas of inundation to be predicted over the next fifty, a hundred, and three, four, five hundred years, should there be, and as there is likely to be, particularly with the defeat of Cape Wind by powerful interests, leading to major loss

environmentally of the Cape.

And, of course, war and its environmental impacts are not being cited as yet, except for human casualty, and I think a general statement as to windmills not being party -- they're not likely to become -- they're not likely to be exploded and they're not likely to be sources of terrorism. This has been mentioned by other comments.

I'd like to make one last point, which has to do with the visual impact. You have indicated and by length devoted to visual impacts in your -- in the DEIS, how significant that was in what you take to be the mandate for evaluating environmental impacts, and I think certainly climate change deserves several times length of that physically within the document itself to help the public understand what the major tradeoffs are that we are facing.

Lastly, although children have appeared to testify, and I am a child, an adult psychiatrist, and also to add the fact that I've been involved in researching OSHA back in the late 1960s in Washington leading to the drafting of the

health bill of rights for workers and to the passage of OSHA, and I in the early '80s co-founded Tobacco Product Liability Project as a public health intervention, and I certainly think it's appropriate that I should mention that children and future generations whose health and welfare and experience on the planet are at risk, the children, if they were permitted to see Cape Wind, they would be delighted to look at these wonderful turbines spinning, and you can be sure that every child and every grandchild is going to come and take a look at these windmills, Ted Kennedy notwithstanding, the Egans notwithstanding, and Save Our Sound notwithstanding, that the public and the children of the future will delight, as children always do, in such things, and these are far nicer. I know very few children who would be excited to see a power plant belching or nuclear plant demanding their evacuation.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

So, in closure, I just want to thank you for this opportunity and for setting up the time for direct comment afterwards.

One last thing, I found it very

difficult to read the report on the website. The sections could not -- I could not, not with my XP and my browser, copy and paste so I could actually study it more easily, and it would seem to me that you should have had an alternative place on the site where sections could be downloaded and it would be in Word Doc or something like that so it could be much more easily printed and examined. I may have, of course, missed things. I did a cursory survey of 207 or so pages in Section 5, but those are generally the things that I observed.

Oh, I didn't mention -- I'm sorry. I must add, exotics, I don't know where you indicate that temperature changes are going to result in an overriding introduction of exotics, both fins and, you know, of all parts of the ecosystem, and that could be included as not happening with Cape Wind due to any temperature rise that it would cause. Red tides have not been specifically mentioned that I saw, which would be a product of fossil fuel plants but not a product of Cape Wind, red tides being a result of temperature increases and they break up when the air is colder, when the

water is colder, and by nitrification, the excess nitrogen, I believe, coming from both the power plants and fertilizer and fish kills and so forth.

You also do not mention, and I think you should mention as Dr. Shimian did, mountaintop removal, the fact that ANWR, the National Wildlife Reserve, LNG sites and their explosion risks, none of these things, pipeline ruptures and spills, the explosion of refineries and so forth, none of this gets cited as avoided risks with Cape Wind, and this is certainly something to be the case, nor do we see the calculation that was alluded to by an earlier speaker of deaths due to pneumoconiosis, black lung disease, VOC exposures by people who operate and work with fuel, with fossil fuels, and pipelines and other kinds of servicing.

I think the spill in Hyannis which resulted in the cardiac death of one unfortunate individual, while you could claim it was just excitement or something, you could also say it was also yet to be determined whether he was overwhelmed by fumes and made anxious by that which contributed to a fatal cardiac outcome.

So, thank you very much and good luck,

and I believe that covers all that I wish to contribute. Thank you very much.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Call me a Yachtsman.

I say that because partly it echoes the wonderful beginning of the well known book by Herman

Melville, "Call me Ishmael." Of course, we know or anybody who's familiar with Melville knows that he spent time in Nantucket and wrote about

Nantucket and been a Nantucketer in his wonderful "Moby Dick."

I say call me a Yachtsman because it disturbs me that, I guess the public relations firm or firms that have been hired by I gather one side of this, I guess both sides are probably doing it, but the Cape Wind side has, it seems to me, probably been determined that it's to their advantage to characterize anybody who expresses a concern about this project is some sort of super-wealth yachtsman, and so, I'm trying to dispel that notion. I don't think you have to own a yacht, although it might be fun to sail in one, to have concerns about the -- just the simple environmental and visual aesthetic, as it's sometimes been referred to, impact of this

project. I'd just like to talk about that a
little bit.

By the way, I'd just like to introduce myself a little in terms of this, to put it in some context. I, many years ago knew the people who founded Boston Wind. I have for many years, as many people tonight who may have concerns about this project, been very committed to renewable energy, to alternative energy, long before it became fashionable. A friend of mine started Boston Wind many years ago but this had not yet been deemed a profitable environment at that time.

I first discovered Nantucket when I started -- I went there for the first time in the mid-90s and I traveled there by -- I take the Steamship Authority ferry, I don't travel by yacht. And actually a friend of mine is an engineer on the Steamship Authority ferry between Hyannis and Nantucket. My aunt and uncle live in Falmouth. So, since in about 1995 I've become more familiar with this area from my own direct experience, and I think it is a beautiful area. I think it's a misnomer to argue about -- to use the term "pristine" and argue about what that means.

I don't think it -- probably no place in the world is pristine, but places do have an environmental significance and an environmental meaning and beauty that's very important, that should be important to anybody who calls him or herself an environmentalist, and should be important in an environmental review of a project and its impacts, and in an environmental impact statement.

When I first had the -- so, I wanted to try to find out about this project and I -- the first opportunity I had to begin to explore some of the -- the nature of the proposal was at a toxics camp, toxics campaign, they have -- there's an entity that has an annual conference in Boston called the Toxics Campaign, and I went to their conference and they had groups that had been invited to tables, maybe they paid some small fee, I don't know. And I noticed a table at this conference from Cape Wind Associates, Incorporated, and I was very interested in this project, having just fairly recently learned about it, being very curious about what the nature of this could be.

And I went over to the table, and the

first thing I was interested in finding out was what it was going to look like, and I think probably the first thing that many people think about is what is it going to look like. And there's nothing wrong with that, and I want to emphasize that. There's nothing wrong with worrying about what this thing is going to look like. People who have expressed concern about that, there has been an attempt to characterize them as silly people. I want to emphasize that's not the case. And it's not rich people; it's a whole variety of people who have a very healthy, normal concern for what this thing is going to look like, because that is part of our environment.

And I asked. I looked at the table, and I looked to see if there was anything that might address that and I didn't see anything, and I asked the person behind the table if there was anything that showed what this project built would look like, and he knew right away what I was talking about and he reached under the table and pulled out something that they had prepared, and right there I thought, well, I was -- my

skepticism increased because I felt that they weren't -- they were being disingenuous, they were withholding this information and only offering it when someone asked about it, and I found that both a little disturbing but also telling, because it suggested to me that they were manipulating the process, and in the course of presenting their information to the public.

My second experience was, I have done a lot of research on global warming. I know Michael McEllroy, I know the leading atmospheric scientists in the country, in the world, probably, some of them are professors at Harvard University, some of them are professors right here at MIT where this testimony is being taken. And I have made it as a lay person, I guess, I made it my business to try to learn as much as I could about global warming, about climate change, about ozone depletion from people like Michael McEllroy and others, and I, other than serious full-time scientists, I would defer to nobody in terms of my interest and commitment to addressing these issues.

I went to a panel at the Museum of

Natural History on this issue. It was a fund raiser for the Museum of Natural History at Harvard. And the first thing I noticed in the program that they were handing out was that Cape Wind Associates, Incorporated, were the number one sponsor of this evening. They had given \$5,000 to sponsor this. And you could say, well, that's good, they're sponsoring an event about something good. But my sense of it was that Cape Wind had been throwing around an awful lot of money to buy influence among people in the environmental community and in global -- in the community of people concerned about global warming in a way that I think is cause for concern, because I think people should evaluate this on the basis of the merits or the demerits and not in the basis of whether somebody has handed them \$5,000. So, that was the second little flag or warning sign to me, but I continued to try to find out more about the nature of the project.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

I then went to a discussion at the Harvard Business School that one of the top people, not Jim Gordon but one of his partners, was doing a presentation on the Cape Wind,

Incorporated, proposal, and a lot of it was over my head because I'm kind of trained financially, but it was interesting that some of the information was -- it's my understanding that some of the information is not being disclosed to the That's a concern. This is on public -in public waters. It's going to have a tremendous impact on public areas. And yet to date, as far as I'm aware, there is information about their business plan and about the investors that is not being disclosed to the public, and I think we have the right to know what is going on with this kind of proposal. So, I came away continuing to feel that I wasn't getting the kind of information that I had hoped for.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The next experience I had was the Harvest Food Co-Op here in Cambridge where I live had for a while a project called One Minute Activist and you could just pick up a letter, the group might propose a letter be sent on a particular issue concern, environmental concerns, what it was entirely about and you could just sign the letter and then put it in the other box and they would send it in for you. And I encountered

one that was urging Governor Romney to expedite the review process, claiming that if you didn't expedite it you were somehow slowing it down, and it didn't make any sense to me. I think there's an argument to be made for a careful, thoughtful review, and I didn't see any reason why it should be expedited and I got a little suspicious and I called the person at the Harvard Student Club to ask him about the group that had sponsored it and who had brought forward this particular One Minute Activist letter, and he explained to me -- I said, do you know whether this group received any money from Cape Wind, and it turns out that they had received a contribution, it seemed like a small, relatively modest contribution, but to me -- and that was undisclosed, there was no disclosure of this in the One Minute Activist thing. And again, I came away feeling like the proponents of this project were buying influence in the nominally environmentalist-oriented community in ways that I felt were manipulating the process, trying to ram this thing through, rather than persuading people on the basis of the merits of the proposal.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

And the final experience I had was I

went to a debate here at MIT between Jim Gordon, who I guess is the CEO of -- the leading person in terms of this -- putting forward this proposal for Cape Wind, Incorporated, it was a debate between Jim Gordon and the paid lobbyist for, I guess, I don't remember the name, but the Alliance to Protect Nantucket Sound, I guess. The two of them debated the issue here at MIT just a few -- not far from here, and at the end of the evening I went up to ask -- I had asked a question that hadn't really been answered by Jim Gordon, I didn't feel, and I wanted to pursue it, I thought. And as I approached him, he interrupted me in mid-sentence in a very aggressive way and I felt like he's sort of bullying me, he said, "Do you own a car?" And I said, "No, I don't own a car." And then, of course, he went on to something else, because he thought, I guess, that if I acknowledged owning a car that he was necessarily going to win some sort of argument about a hundred and thirty wind turbines in Nantucket Sound. Well, of course, he owned a car, because

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

he had come to the, it turned out, to that evening in a car, and I just feel like there's been a

tremendous amount of hypocrisy on the part of the proponents in characterizing those people who have concerns about this as wealthy, yacht owners, NIMBYs, or people who aren't sensitive to the environment. I think there are probably just as many people on both sides who are generally concerned and have been working hard for a long time to try to address the important concerns about the environment that, some of which are contested in the context of this particular proposal.

So, I want to say that my concern is that there is a beautiful area, there aren't many beautiful areas left. I don't claim that it's pristine, but there are not many beautiful areas left in our world, there are not many beautiful areas left in New England. I know; I've lived here for a long time. The beautiful areas that exist that are left that are important to us ought to be treated carefully before we roll over for a private for-profit corporation that is trying to ram something through in a diminished -- relatively diminished regulatory process that has not yet been fully developed to match the

circumstances in which this particular proposal is being put forward. I think we have to resist being bullied and being -- allowing this to be rammed through.

There are concerns about it; there are things that are -- arguments to be made for it.

But I personally believe the central issue, and a very legitimate one, is what is it going to look like, what is it going to feel like, how are we and people who live there and frequent Nantucket, Martha's Vineyard and the Cape and the waters in and around that area, how are we all going to feel when we see 130 giant wind turbines that may be 112 feet tall.

I'm being asked to wrap it up. It was my understanding that you could give unlimited -- that there was not a time limit.

(Pause for tape change.)

JAMES WILLIAMSON: I've been informed the stenographer who's taking this testimony is getting a little concerned about how late it is, and I had thought that there wasn't a limit on this testimony, so, I thought that it was okay to make extensive remarks in this context. I want to

be sensitive to the needs of the person, the stenographer, and acknowledge that she'd like to get out of here. I hope that I haven't been unfair. I mean, I'm doing this at the end of a long night. Have I gone on longer than most other people?

THE REPORTER: Well, I'm concerned that
-- They're starting to start to wrap up in there
and there's still someone else --

certainly don't -- I hope that I haven't rambled on too much. I thought this was an appropriate opportunity to amplify the remarks that I may not be able to get to make in public testimony. I thought it was important to cover the territory, to stress, to buttress my concern in the ways that I did, and I hope that those who are listening will be taking these concerns into consideration and mindful that these circumstances are not necessarily the most conducive -- it's now ten after eleven, and you've probably just heard the little exchange, the somewhat tense exchange over how long this testimony is, and with that, I appreciate everybody who's been involved and their

service in accepting and taking testimony and the people who have been here tonight. Thank you.

RILEY NEUGEBAUER: Hi. My name is Riley Neugebauer. I'm here representing EnviroCitizen, a non-profit that turns out one of the largest student environmental list-serves in the country with 11,500 subscribers, and we are in favor of the Cape Wind Project.

The opposition takes issue with the placement of the wind farm and how it will change the appearance of the horizon of the Cape. It's understandable that property owners don't want to alter their view but the issue must be addressed in the larger context. Without renewable energy plants, the coast of Cape Cod will be changed because of climate change, caused by pollution from dirty power plants, and that's on top of the negative impacts that climate change will bring to both ecology, tourism, and industry in the area. Additionally, another consequence of climate change will be rising sea levels which would damage the landscape significantly.

One of the most important issues that we make sure students are aware of when working with

them on any clean energy campaign including Cape
Wind is environmental justice. A study by
Northeastern University professors shows that the
communities with the lowest income have on average
seven times as many pounds of chemical emissions
from polluting facilities per square mile. In
addition, communities consisting primarily of
people of color have five times as many pounds of
chemical emissions from polluting facilities per
square mile. I do not think that anyone ever
asked them about how they felt about the view of
visual landscape associated with the power plant
coming to their community.

Too often, the opposition to the Cape
Wind project comes from white wealthy people.
This group of people want renewable energy but
only when it is somewhere else. And now there's
an opportunity to build a pollution-free facility,
a facility that most living with a power plant in
their back yard now would love to see in their
neighborhood and people are rejecting it for
reasons that seem narrowly focused and a lack of
concern for public welfare and health overall.

As I look around the room and at this

public hearing, there are very few people of color here. Maybe we should think about that and think about who is receiving most of the ill effects from our energy decisions up to this point.

I'd like to see the DEIS include more information on how this wind farm will improve public health and how it can contribute to environmental justice in Massachusetts. It undoubtedly will lessen the number of asthma attacks and respiratory problems in the state and improve school attendance for kids who miss due to these ailments.

Here is a chance to have something offshore that will not hurt public health but in fact better it for residents on the Cape and overall for everyone because it will displace 90 million gallons of oil and a million tons of CO2. We need to choose to have clean energy and start the shift to renewable now.

Massachusetts has a chance to be the first state to have a large offshore project that provides significant amounts of renewable energy and to start counteracting the polluting facilities that are detrimental to public health,

## WRITTEN STATEMENTS

Statement at public hearing held on December 16, 2004 at MIT (Room 10-25) by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office on a proposal by Cape Wind Associates to build 130 wind turbines in Nantucket Sound.

Dr. Jonathan Haughton

Department of Economics, Suffolk University,

12 Boston, MA

Economic Costs Exceed Economic Benefits for the Cape Wind Project

Thank you. I wish to focus my remarks on just one point that poses -- or should pose -- an insurmountable obstacle to the wind farm project. Presidential Executive Order 12866 of September 30, 1993 states that "each agency shall ... propose or adopt a regulation only upon a reasoned determination that the benefits of the intended regulation justify its costs." The Draft

EIS itself notes(p.2-2) that "the benefits which reasonably may be expected to accrue from the proposal must be balanced against its reasonably foreseeable detriments."

Although comments on costs and benefits are to be found scattered throughout the Draft EIS, the Army Corps does not, however directly address the bottom-line question: "Are the social benefits of the project greater than the costs?' More importantly, it turns out that when one does, in fact, address this question, the answer turns out to be, "No": The benefits do not, in fact, measure up to the costs.

That they do not is made clear in a report submitted to the Army Corps on May 14 of this year by the Beacon Hill Institute at Suffolk University. As the principal author of this report, I can state that, on the basis of the available facts, the wind farm project fails a cost-benefit test of the kind envisioned by the Presidential Executive Order. My interest in cost-Benefit analysis is long-standing: I have taught the subject at Harvard University, Suffolk University and elsewhere since 1987.

In our analysis, we estimate the economic costs of the project to be 9.06 cents per kWh of electricity produced, very close to the figure of 9.00 cents reported in the Draft EIS (p.3-307). This is expensive for factory-gate electricity — on my most recent bill from N-Star I paid 6.32 cents for the generation costs of the electricity I used.

But wind power has important virtues too. We estimate the economic benefits generated by Cape Wind to be 7.06 cents/kWh. This breaks down into

- savings in fuel of 4.95 cents/kWh. This figure takes into account the likelihood of periods of high energy prices in the future.
- savings in capital and operating costs of 0.98 cents/kWh. This figure is low because backup generating capacity must still be available to offset most of the wind farm's capacity, cor times when the wind stops blowing (or blows too hard).
- health savings due to reduced emissions,
  worth 1.02 cents/kWh. the Draft EIS
  overstates these benefits tenfold because it

assumes, incorrectly, that electricity from

Cape Wind would offset only the dirtiest

power stations in New England; and that those

power stations would not become cleaner over

- greater energy independence, which we value at 0.10 cents/kWh. In this context, note that even when complete, the project would provide less than 1% of the electricity in New

England.

time.

The bottom line is that the economic costs exceed the economic benefits by 1.99 cents/kWh, or by \$209 million in present value terms. This is a large margin. One is left with the clear and powerful conclusion that the benefits of the intended regulation -- which would allow Cape Wind to build the wind farm -- do not justify its costs. The balance could change in the future, but at this point in time, this particular project is not a good one.

The key result -- that economic costs exceed the economic benefits is robust. It stands even if one ignores any aesthetic effects or makes the most pessimistic assumptions concerning the

future price of oil; and it does not even consider 1 2 the effects of the project on tourism -- which the Draft EIS believes, without evidence, would on 3 4 balance be positive and which we, based on survey 5 data, expect to be negative. One puzzle remains: why would a private 6 7 firm undertake an economically unattractive project? The answer is subsidies, in the form of 8 - accelerated depreciation allowances; 9 10 - a possible Federal production tax credit; 11 and the sale of Massachusetts "green 12 credits." 13 Together, we can expect these to bring Cape wind 4.04 cents/kWh cost of production. 14 15 While some amount of subsidy to wind power is appropriate, we find that subsidies on such a 16 17 scale are excessive and go beyond what serves the 18 public good. /Table attached to submission/ 19 20 21 22 Oceans Public Trust Initiative 23

My name is Cindy Lowry, and I am the

24

Director of the Oceans Public Trust Initiative, a project of the Earth Island Institute. Our mission is to ensure that the public trust in coastal and ocean resources is fully protected.

Here, the Corps had turned section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act into an all-purpose tool for allowing private developers to take control of public trust resources. The Corps has opened up a gaping loophole in the laws intended to manage our oceans by allowing private parties to exploit the oceans for its exclusive use and profit.

While it is certainly true that we, as a nation, are not doing nearly enough to combat climate change, we are also failing to do enough to protect our coastal resources. Offshore wind energy could have a role in decreasing the nation's harmful emissions, but not until we develop a national program for this purpose. The Cape Wind project will not even make an appreciable dent in global warming, but it will devastate Nantucket Sound and sacrifice the public trust under an inadequate environmental review. At the same time, it will set a terrible

precedent.

At the heart of this problem is the basic question: Can a developer build a project in public trust waters with nothing more than a section 10 permit? For well over one year, we have attempted to get the federal government to answer this question. We have never received a direct response.

The Congressional Research Service recently stated: "It appears that no federal agency, including the Army Corps of Engineers, which permits structures only for navigability purposes, can authorize the occupation and use of OCS lands for wind or other renewable energy purposes .... [C]onstruction on the OCS without first obtaining these rights would remain unlawful."

I would like to ask you:

Does the Corps agree with that

statement?

The continued failure of the federal government to answer this question, while at the same time pushing the Cape Wind application through an inadequate review process is

inexcusable.

In our opinion, a section 10 permit alone is meaningless for this project. The Corps should reject this permit application. Without federal legislation; without a means of transferring property rights; and without an adequate process (the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy and the Congressional Research Service, among others, agree); this project cannot possible be deemed to be in the public interest, and should not be allowed to go forward.

Tom Gelsthorpe

16 | Cataumet, MA 02534

I've lived on the Cape for 42 years, have sailed among the Cape and Islands all that time, and I favor the wind farm. Opponents fear change and a threat to tradition, but they seem to forget that it was commercial wind power that first put Cape Cod on the map -- starting with discoverer Bartholomew Gosnold and the Mayflower

settlers arriving in their windjammers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

The tradition continued with immigrants arriving in sailing vessels for another two centuries and with whaling ships that made

Nantucket famous and incidentally started the "oil industry," later replaced by petroleum on which we are now so precariously dependent.

Many of the Cape's early historic homes still treasured by today's residents were built with fortunes amassed by merchants plying the Seven Seas in wind-driven ships. The masts of tall ships were not disdained by residents then or Early waterfront homes still cherished today often include widow's walks specially designed for spotting sails on the horizon carrying loved ones safely home. Nowadays tall ship regattas draw thousands of viewers thrilling to the innovation and daring of the ancient mariners who built them and discovered the world with them. I attended a tall ship parade in Boston in 1992 that was watched by over a million spectators. Where was the outcry against the 'ugliness' of wind power on that day? Does it only have value as a nostalgia item, but not as a practical possibility?

Arguments against the wind generators consist mainly in disliking the way they're going to look. It seems childish to imagine that a productive, innovative civilization can be invisible. It has never been invisible. The only major, renewable means of generating electricity to date has required the damming of virtually all of our major rivers. That renewable technology involves tradeoffs. By most measurements dams are more environmentally disruptive than windmills -but many dams and the reservoirs they impound are considered picturesque and multi-purpose and have become tourist attractions in themselves. The mid 20th century journalist Margaret Bourke-White built her career around photographing dams, skyscrapers and other industrial achievements. What has changed so much that we consider the industrial ingenuity automatically "ugly" -especially when it can help to free us from other industrial dependencies that are even more troubling?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Nantucket Sound is not untouched by industrial activity. Thousands of power boats ply its waters daily, from ferries, freighters and

commercial fishermen to pleasure boats. Nantucket Island's airport is second busiest in the state, with nearly a quarter million passengers yearly. Neither is the Cape untouched bu industrial equipment. The first thing sailors see approaching the Sound side are the water towers visible miles before the shore can be seen, Before the beach is visible, thousands of waterfront homes can be seen lining the shore. Each is packed with appliances dependent on reliable electricity.

To claim Cape Wind is a private interest unfairly subsidized is a canard. This

Commonwealth subsidizes education, health care and many other activities both public and private because of direct and indirect public benefits.

Waterfront homes are private property deriving great value from views of this public resource.

Every Cape harbor and river is packed summer long with boats. One of them is mine. Are these not "industrial products" that change the view?

You have to cross the world's widest sea level canal to get to Cape Cod -- Built expressly to facilitate private economic activity; barges

that move oil up the East Coast, numerous freighters, cruise ships and tens of thousands of pleasure boats. The three huge bridges that cross the Canal are widely admired. The while canal complex with its water and service roads is heavily used recreationally and has become a tourist attraction in itself. It's late in the game to pretend the Cape is truly pristine. yet isn't it a better place for being thoughtfully civilized?

The visibility of the towers should not be exaggerated. The nearest one to shore is over four miles away in a place where summer visibly often stays under four miles for long periods. I believe that many people will find the wind generators graceful. The rest will get used to them, just as we got used to the canal, buildings, roads and the power lines that serve them.

Rather than fearing change or reviling the ingenious profiles of wind generators, perhaps we can think of them as our "tall ships of the 21st Century."

Foremost among practical reasons for the wind farm is the need to generate electricity in a

safe and sustainable way. Our need for petroleum will not cease, but anything we can do to reduce that need increases our security. Repeated wars to protect oil supplies are creating new windows every day at home and elsewhere. reliable electricity is not a mere convenience, either; home refrigeration, for example, is a huge public health benefit, by enabling safe food preservation year round. Electricities benefits are so important and manifold that we tend to take them for granted.

Even staunch opponents have not offered to junk their washing machines, TVs, refrigerators or computers to "conserve" electricity. Nearby Fall River has rejected a natural gas terminal but we're going to need more of that, too, as time goes by, like it or not. Environmentally-minded citizens need to move beyond the luxury of being against almost everything. I'm more worried that Cape Cod become a laughingstock of NIMBYism than an industrial blight.

Unless you've sailed local waters in the off-season when motorboats are absent, as I have, you don't know what "pristine waters" are. Half a

dozen motorboats roil the waters more than a 1 2 hundred windmills will. Yet no sailor I know proposes banning motorboats. It's one of the 3 tradeoffs we learn to live with. I believe that 4 in this case, there's wind enough for all of us. 5 Let's try to be receptive to the 6 7 benefits the wind farm can offer. With a little less fear and doubt and a little more thought, the 8 towers might seem beautiful. 9 10 11 12 13 December 16, 2004 14 15 TO: DEIS Hearing From: Scott Bearse 16 17 Questions submitted regarding the Draft 18 19 Environmental Impact Statement for the Cape Wind 20 project. 21 1. Will the combination of electrical 22 turbine generators and underwater high 23 voltage transmission lines interfere

with shipboard navigation systems?

24

Could the towers be both navigational hazards and interfere with navigation at the same time? 2. Will the generators cause interference with VHF communications between ships or between ships and shore facilities? Could this be dangerous to ships avoiding collisions or ships in distress? Have the current studies in the Draft 3.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Environmental Impact Study considered the nodal effects including maxima, minima, and resonant effects of an array of electro-magnetic sources and also noise sources operating at the same cyclical rates in close proximity to each other? The normal attenuation of electrical and acoustical noise does not apply in situations with multiple point sources.

Will the generators (EMI sources) and 4. towers (grounded antennae) affect the electrical grounding of navigational instruments of ships in the vicinity of

			153
1		the wind farm?	
2	5.	Will the towers attract a much	
3		larger percentage of lightning	
4		strikes in the vicinity of the	
5		wind farm?	
6	6.	Will a permanent source of	
7		underwater noise permanently	
8		drive off fish populations	
9		versus transient the transient	
10		effect of a ship?	
11	7.	Could adjacent noises sources at	
12		"almost" the same frequency hetrodyne	e to
13		cause a beat frequency with signification	ant
14		noise peaks at multiples of the level	ls
15		indicated in the draft document?	
16	8.	How will the Wind Farm affect	
17		sedimentation patterns in Nantucket	
18		Sound given its complex rhythm of	
19		current patterns? Could these change	es
20		affect current ship channels and	
21		navigation of the Sound?	
22	9.	Would the large amount of transforme:	r
23		oil be vulnerable to sabotage in a	
24		terrorist act against our environmen	t?

What would the environmental effect be and the cost to clean it up?

3

4

1

2

\* \* \* \*

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

My name is John McAlpin and I'm grateful for the opportunity to lend my voice to the discussion of the Cape Wind Project. While I am a teacher at Belmont Hill School, these comments reflect my views alone. It was my good fortune to attend a conference last week at NYU sponsored by former President Clinton. The conference was a forum to discuss new energy policy for the United States -- Policy that takes into consideration not only our energy future but also issues of national security, international development, social justice and global climate change. While the challenges ahead for us as a nation on each of these fronts is daunting, the interrelationships between these issues is clear. Simply put, any solutions for one problem must be compatible with solutions for the others. Considering the fate of the Cape Wind project proposal, in the context of those discussions, I see an important opportunity

before us.

As a nation, we are at a crossroads and the resolution I imagine for this project could serve as a catalyst for fundamental change across the country. New England has been the birthplace of a number of revolutions and the thoughtful resolution of this controversy might prove to be the next "shot heard around the world." What will be required however is a sacrifice of a kind not often practiced by the citizenry of this country.

In this debate, Cape Wind Associates has at times been cast in the role of profiteer -just another corporation in business to make money for its investors. Dissenting viewpoints from those who object to this project have also been criticized -- cited as another case of Not In My Back Yard -- thier critics say -- the self-interest of a few again put ahead of the environment and perhaps, a greater good.

I want to help reframe the debate and suggest that Cape Wind Associates might better be thought of as pioneers ...... not profiteers.

I want to help reframe the debate and suggest the citizens who object to this project

consider a new position ..... one that would cast them in the role of patriots.

This is one of those times when individuals need to reflect and "to ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

Consider what a change in your position against this project could mean for the future of renewable energy projects across this country?

Consider the power of your example if you decided to put the common good ahead of self-interest?

Consider how your sacrifice might inspire others in places where the winds blow to see their own cooperation as an act of patriotism? Consider the message you could send to utilities, state governments, the present federal administration, and the world if this group of people banded together to recapture the spirit of citizenship because while it might cost them something, thier sacrifice was the right thing to do?

One thing I know for certain. Your sacrifice would make you heroes in my classroom!

I would be able to talk about a group of people who recognized that a personal sacrifice on their

part could make this planet's environment just a little bit cleaner. That their sacrifice made us, as a nation, a little less reliant upon foreign sources of energy and therefore a bit more secure and energy independent. A people who's sacrifice brought jobs home to the United States and moved us forward in an area of science and technology where we have been lagging behind other nations that have chosen renewable energy as a priority for their future and economic well-being. I would talk about a people who's sacrifice here and now send a message to the rest of the country and the world that we have a vision for our future that is environmentally sane and socially just and one that did not require us to send off more of our sons or daughters to war in a far away country.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

A great many people in my classroom and around the United States and the world are counting on the adults in their lives to make wise and prudent decisions ... yes, and sometimes even sacrifices. I only wish I was in a position to make a similar sacrifice.

I believe that future generations would point to your example as the type of citizenship

that really changed the climate of America ... not only the environmental climate, but the social, business, moral, and political climate, one that valued life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness of future generations as much as it did for its own generation.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

\* \* \* \* \*

Dr. Michael Kryzanek, Professor of Political Science, Bridgewater State College

Remarks delivered to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers hearing on the Nantucket Sound Wind Farm, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, December 16, 2004.

Theses remarks are adapted from a newspaper column written by Dr. Kryzanek for the Patriot Ledger on November 27, 2004.

puffing in Massachusetts over the proposed
Nantucket Sound wind farm. Not since the early

days of the Big Dig debate has the public

There has been a lot of huffing and

expressed such an interest in a major project that will impact the lives and the environment of our state.

It is not as if wind power is new to Massachusetts since Hull erected a 150 foot tall turbine, which generates enough energy to tend to the needs of 250 homes in that town. But one turbine in Hull is certainly different than 130 turbines out in one of America's pristine and beautiful playgrounds.

The proponents of wind power tout their project as creating jobs and providing for most of the energy needs of the Cape and Islands. At first glance, the project can be viewed as an alternative to our growing oil dependency, the finite nature of fossil fuels and the disturbing reports on global warming.

But saying all this, the question is, do we in Massachusetts quickly latch on to an alternative source of energy and plunk it down right in the middle of our watery icon?

It would seem that the common sense response to all the corporate and political wind that has been expended so far over this issue is

first to make a concerted effort to push for conservation measures household by household.

The answers to avoiding energy dependence and cutting down on carbon dioxide emissions are already in place -- solar panels, smaller cars, public transportation, the clean-up of "dirty factories", low-cost efficiency changes in homes and dare I say driving 55 again.

We really haven't begun a statewide conversation on energy conservation. We need to talk seriously about incentives to preserve energy and disincentives for those who waste energy. We need to recognize that when faced with energy concerns and shortages in the future and the immediate response should be belt-tightening not a fascination with a new gadget.

Now is the time for aggressive political leadership on this crucial issue of energy conservation. Senator Kennedy and Governor Romney must join forces not just to save Nantucket Sound from the invasion of the propellers, but to push for comprehensive conservation measures now. All of us in Massachusetts should follow a common sense approach to energy conservation and leave

Nantucket Sound pristine and beautiful.

Comments for Hearing on Cape Winds Project at MIT, December 16, 2004.

My name is Rex du Pont; I live in Weston, MA and we have a house on Cape Cod that is probably one of the closest houses on the Cape to the proposed project.

By way of background, I was the Chief
Policy Analyst for Electric Utility Policy for the
Federal Energy Agency during the Project
Independence Policy for the Federal Energy Agency
during the Project Independence period of 1976/77.
Perhaps, of more relevance to my comments tonight,
I have most recently been involved with the design
and testing of experimental aircraft, and have had
some experience with the hazards of using and
testing new machinery.

One of the comments by a peer reviewer of this study was "The worst possible environmental outcome would be a failed and derelict project, with the owners in bankruptcy

court. This would leave an unattended wind farm exposed to the elements for an extended period of time, with no clear legal path to alternatively refurbish the project, slavage the remains, or decommission the project. This scenario has recently been played out in the late 1980's in California."

As I understand the proposal, Cape Winds announced in 2003, more than a year after they filed for permits, that they intended to use a new GE wind turbine with a capacity of 3.6 megawatts. I believe that since then, GE may have actually built and installed something under ten of these units. The largest project that I have been able to trace was on the Arklow Bank off Ireland that used 7 units that have been in service for less than one year.

This project plans to install 130 such units all at once. I would like to know what the installation and service history has been so far on the units that have been delivered. What is the overall reliability? What have been the teething problems at the Arklow site?

I understand that the unit weighs 290

tons. It incorporates components like large gear boxes that need lubrication, and transformers that usually use some kind of oil bath for cooling.

What levels of potentially toxic materials are used in these units and what is the experience with leaks of any kind? What weight of what chemicals are in each and what part of this is expected to leak over time?

What guarantees does Cape Wind offer as to their financial and technical ability and willingness to weather all the teething problems of a project with new, relatively untested hardware on such a large scale? Or alternatively, are they willing to lease these units from GE under an agreement that GE would assume the responsibility for the installation and maintenance of the units for a period of, say, five years from startup and guarantee the technical completion of the project?

The idea of wind power is attractive, and there have been many good experiences with it around the world. There have been failures as well. There are also many unknowns in a project of this size and complexity. This plan worries

me, because it is taking a high-risk approach by going full scale all at once, rather than testing four or five unity on site for a period to see just what problems may develop before deciding on full implementation.

Rex du Pont

\* \* \* \*

My name is Simon Bunyard, and I am here to express my strong support for the Cape Wind Project.

I have been following the lengthy debate in the press about the project for more than a year now, and I have read summaries of the Army Corps' very comprehensive and painstakingly objective environmental impact study. My conclusions are these:

- 1) The project will cause far less environmental impact than alternative fossil fuel generating capacity: oil spills, air pollution, greenhouse gas production, etc.
  - 2) The project will not be an eyesore.

To the contrary, I find windmills very elegant and graceful, much like sail boats;

- 3) The existence of windmills off the shore of Cape Cod will not prevent me and my family from enjoying vacations in the area which I do frequently. In fact I think it will be a tourism attraction.
- 4) The political opposition to this project is based on a selfish NIMBY attitude that is not considering the greater and very important public benefit. The opposition from self-interested politicians is nothing short of a flagrant conflict of interest.
- 5) The project will lessen our dependence on foreign oil and reduce the extraordinary cost of defending that supply line (the war in Iraq?); and
- 6) The project will slow down the depletion of fossil fuel which is in limited supply (I strongly suspect that the wind will be around far longer than fossil fuel).

I urge the Army Corps, and those politicians with a role in the permitting of this project, to do all you can to accelerate the

necessary approvals and to eliminate the roadblocks that have been thrown in the front of it by a vociferous, but wrong-headed, opposition. To not approve it will throw a terrible cloud over future wind energy projects in this country and discourage private investment from ever tackling on like it again. Is that really the message you want to send to the country? By denying the project, in one fell swoop you will have set wind energy production in this country back a decade, at a time when it is critical to our future. Or, by supporting this project, you can be looked back on by future generations as paving the way our energy solvency. Our children's future is in your hands.

I think we all owe a great deal of gratitude to Cape Wind and, particularly, its visionary and very committed founder, Jim Gordon, for pressing on with this project. Your perseverance is remarkable. My hat is off to you. I hope it will have been worth your while. Thank you for sticking with it.

\* \* \* \* \*

Comments on Cape Wind Energy Project 1 2 Draft Environmental Impact Statement December 16, 2004 3 4 Submitted to: 5 U.S. Army Corps of 6 Engineers 7 Submitted by: John H. Manning Lydia B. Graves II 8 9 68 Cotting Street Medford, MA 02155 10 11 12 We are lifelong Massachusetts residents. 13 We have enjoyed the treasures of the Cape, the National Seashore, the Islands, and their waters 14 15 all of our lives. We own beachfront property on Cliff Road, Nantucket that overlooks Nantucket 16 17 Sound and the proposed wind farm. The stewardship 18 of this property has passed down through 19 generations of our family, and through great 20 effort most of it remains undeveloped. Like many 21 others, we habe a deeply personal stake in the 22 future of Nantucket sound and the land surrounding 23 it.

In general, we support the proposed wind

24

farm and the conclusions and mitigation recommendations of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. When the project was first proposed several years ago, and for quite some time after that, we were neutral and skeptical. However, everything that we have been able to learn indicates that the project:

- is technically and economically
  feasible;
- is pathbreaking, but certainly not unprecedented;
- will provide significant energy and pollution reduction benefits; andwill help diversify our energy
- portfolio and reduce fossil fuel dependence, thereby increasing our security.

On the other side of the coin, we have seen no technical or science-based case that there are likely to be significant negative effects.

The negative case boils down to the aesthetic effects of the project on this visual, cultural and recreational resource. It seems to us that project opponents have dominated the public

discussion in this regard. This is why we have chosen to comment.

First, the aesthetics are distinctly subjective. There is value and beauty in an uninterrupted horizon. But we also find interest and beauty in modern wind turbines. We have seen several wind farms in open farming areas of the upper Midwest. We have seen many small to mid-sized wind farms throughout Cornwall in England, generally in very close proximity to human activity. Count us among those willing to see them offshore from our front porch in exchange for their benefits.

Second, Nantucket Sound and its bordering lands are a treasure, but not the pristine resource that many portray. This is not the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is a resource that has been and is intensively used for a variety of purposes. These uses change over time. It is crisscrossed by hundreds of aircraft, power boats, oil tankers and other traffic daily. It is bordered by roads, towns, marinas, chemically manicured lawns and radio towers. It is fished to the point of peril. The wind farm is

another use that is arguably more benign and beneficial than others that are widely accepted.

Third, Some of the specific aesthetic criticisms we have seen are at best a stretch. for example, the draft EIS includes a Visual Impact Assessment by an architectural historian. This recommended a finding of adverse effects for the Nantucket Historic District. We are well acquainted with this District. While the finding may be accurate at some level, the wind farm is far down the ladder of adverse effects on this historic resource. A broken horizon a dozen miles away does not begin to compare with the commuter jets overhead, and the immense marina, both bringing people to dine in luxury and shop at expensive boutiques. Our history is not and should not be static.

Fourth, the Draft EIS notes that there are no adverse environmental justice impacts. We would go further to say that the wind farm should have a strongly positive environmental justice effect as an example of the affluent sharing the presence of a power generation facility.

In sum, we believe it is time for us as

	171
1	citizens to put up or shut up about cleaning the
2	environment, developing renewables, and improving
3	our security. These goals will simply not be
4	realized if we do not act responsibly. The wind
5	farm's trade-offs are small in comparison.
6	Subject to continued care and scrutiny, we should
7	move forward with this project.
8	Thank you for the opportunity to submit
9	these comments.
10	
11	* * * *
12	
13	Tim Burke
14	20 Pine Tree Lane
15	Edgartown, MA 02539
16	
17	I do not support the Nantucket Sound
18	Wind Farm.
19	Projects like this will only allow our
20	country to claim of saving a tiny amount of energy
21	An estimated 10 cents per household per month.
22	All this while we continue to create
23	pollution driving our SUVs and mini vans.
24	The technology is available to harness
ļ	I control of the second of the

natural energy. Solar panels when first developed came with a tax deduction for home owners who installed them.

Currently California residents, who choose to use these panels, can sell back to power companies excess energy, claimed by thier panels.

Tax credits are currently available for the self employed who drive a 3 thousand truck SUV. This would be a good time to provide a similar deduction for the HYBRID CAR.

Let's not lose sight that the Nantucket Sound is in the hands of the State of Mass and the American people. Doesn't this wind farm violate the State's prior legislative attempts to protect Nantucket Sound.

I'm for reducing dependency on foreign oil. But not to a private developer taking 24 sq. miles of Government land for free to build a WIND FARM with tax subsidies.

A developer who has never built a wind plant before. While in line, Matt Palmer of the Wind Farm \*\* stated the union picketers are outside, the last union built project, the Big Dig -- will we have that in the Sound.

 $\label{thm:money} \mbox{ Money and Tax breaks talk and this WIND}$   $\mbox{FARM SHOULD WALK.}$ 

4 | \* \* \* \* \*

Ken Samoylenko

7 | 256 Thoreau Street

8 Concord, MA 01742-2427

10 | December 16, 2004

My name is Ken Samoylenko. I am a mechanical engineer and a resident of Concord,

Massachusetts, and I am a member of Clean Power

Now supporting the wind project on Nantucket

Sound.

I would like to thank the Army Corps for this opportunity to comment on your comprehensive draft EIS.

You have appropriately documented the fact that the project could displace equivalent energy from fossil plants that would otherwise annually emit a million tons of carbon dioxide (a major contributor to global warming).

However I would like to suggest that you put this somewhat nebulous number in context to show the benefit to the public interest.

For example, if two of the largest fossil fueled power plants in Massachusetts, Brayton Point and the Canal Plant, which together emit approximately 14 million tons of CO2 a year, were to reduce their combined electrical generation by the amount of the new wind farm generation, the reduction of the 1 million tons of CO2 will be 7%. This is enough for these two large power plants, in conjunction with the wind farm, to meet the Kyoto protocol reduction by 2010.

No other single project, energy related or otherwise, can make such a substantial contribution to reducing greenhouse gasses from Southeastern Massachusetts. It is our obligation to future generations to do so.

I would respectfully like to ask that the Army Corps incorporate in the Final EIS a discussion of relative impact on fossil power plant CO2 reductions which are definitely in the public interest.

	175
1	Respectfully submitted,
2	/s/
3	Ken Samoylenko
4	
5	* * * *
6	
7	Piers Sanders
8	4 Seeleys Close
9	Beaconsfield, Bucks, U.K.
10	
11	Cons outweigh pros for the project.
12	- The savings per Kwh is less than the
13	gov't subsidy.
14	- Gov't subsidies can be used far more
15	efficiently for renewable energy.
16	- Any benefits that are produced will be
17	small amounts for many, but the costs
18	incurred (reduction in property value,
19	etc.) will be high for an unlucky few.
20	- There must be back-up for when there
21	is no wind.
22	- There must still me the same number of
23	conventional power stations.
24	- There are many areas in the U.S. with
	I

176 better wind and these are inland (in the 1 2 midwest), hence cheaper to develop. - Allowing it sets a precedent for 3 4 developers to take offshore areas with little restriction. 5 6 7 8 9 I wish to comment of the Cape Wind 10 proposed wind farm, NAE-2004-3381. 11 I support the proposed project. 12 I believe this project is a great 13 opportunity for the U.S. to start to get off foreign oil. 14 15 Compared to other potential power-generating methods currently in use, wind 16 17 energy is far preferable. For example, nuclear 18

power, coal, oil or natural gas have far more serious negative environmental and health impacts than your report shows the wind turbines would have.

19

20

21

22

23

24

Aesthetics is a small price to pay for reducing U.S. reliance on nuclear, oil, gas and coal power.

1 Thank you, 2 Ann MacAdam 3 18 Lexington St. 4 Canton, MA 02021 5 6 7 Dr. Matthew M. Staffier 8 9 Professor of Environmental Studies 10 Endicott College 11 Beverly, Massachusetts 12 13 I would like to take this opportunity as a 14 scientist, parent and Commonwealth resident to 15 express my support for the Cape Wind project. I 16 ask all involved to see beyond the rhetoric of 17 nuisances and to consider the larger issues of increasing energy demand, the health issues 18 19 associated with our default energy source of coal 20 and also the legitimate concerns that many have

regarding global climate change.

state, our nation and our future.

21

22

23

24

and global context I earnestly believe that the

Cape Wind project is in the best interest of our

In both a local

178 Sincerely 1 2 /s/ Dr. Matthew M. Staffier 3 4 5 6 7 Francis J. Gallagher, Jr. P.O. Box 66 8 555 Washington Street 9 10 Duxbury, MA 02331 11 12 I strongly support the Cape Wind project 13 in Nantucket Sound. It is time for this country to get started on renewable energy projects. 14 15 There have been too many obstructionist delays. For maybe thirty years, there had been a 16 17 private windmill, metal and probably 50 feet high, just three houses away from us in Duxbury. It was 18 19 dismantled due to age just a few months ago. 20 presence was not even noticed by us any more than 21 the nearby houses and trees. In fact, I did not 22 notice it had been taken down until it had been

The claimed fears of opponents of the

23

24

down for months.

project that the Nantucket Sound view will be seriously adversely affected are overblown. After the windmills are there for a while, no one will even notice them. It is my understanding that the windmills will appear to be no larger than a thumbnail held at arms length for most people who can see them from the shore. They certainly will be less intrusive than the water towers we wee in many of you communities.

Tourism may be enhanced. People may want to view the windmills as a sightseeing event,

Tourism may be enhanced. People may want to view the windmills as a sightseeing event, and others from around the world with an interest in renewable energy may come to see themselves what such a project will look like.

Don't let the elitists defeat or delay this project.

20 | Alan Field

21 | 27 Edward Drive

22 Winchester, MA 01890

I believe strongly both in preserving

natural beauty (such as the Nantucket Sound) and in the urgency of developing renewable sources of energy (such as wind power).

Wind turbines that produce "clean" power are unaesthetic to some, but ultimately they can be removed and are thus reversible.

The global warming, climate change and pollution that results from activities in the U.S. is an urgent problem indeed causing irreversible damage and must be reduced dramatically by measures including the development of renewable energy sources. Clearly one must choose the option that is beneficial and reversible over one that is damaging and irreversible.

If the American people and American government were aggressively addressing these issues with measures such as phasing out vehicles with poor fuel efficiency and agreeing to worldwide environmental goals, then we might be able to maintain our scenic vistas.

Sadly, out society has chosen SUVs over vistas, and as a direct result, we urgently need as many wind projects as possible to compensate.

Thus, I support placing wind turbines in
the Nantucket Sound.

Sincerely,
/s/
Alan Field.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

9

**APEX Reporting** (617) 426-3077

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER AND TRANSCRIBER

This is to certify that the attached proceedings

in the Matter of:

RE: DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT CAPE WIND ENERGY PROJECT NANTUCKET SOUND, MASSACHUSETTS

Place: Cambridge, Massachusetts

Date: December 16, 2004

were held as herein appears, and that this is the true, accurate and complete transcript prepared from the notes and/or recordings taken of the above entitled proceeding.

Marilyn Franklin December 16, 2004 Date

Reporter

Meredith Bruce <u>January 3, 2005</u>

Transcriber Date

> APEX Reporting (617) 426-3077